

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEASIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

<https://archive.org/details/Rooney1978>

T H E U N I V E R S I T Y O F A L B E R T A

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Sieglinde E. H. Rooney
TITLE OF THESIS The Presentation of the Woman in the Plays
 of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED M.A.
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1978

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this
thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private,
scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may
be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
THE PRESENTATION OF THE WOMAN
IN THE PLAYS OF
HERZOG HEINRICH JULIUS VON BRAUNSCHWEIG

by



Sieglinde E. H. Rooney

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Presentation of the Woman in the Plays of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig" submitted by Sieglinde E. H. Rooney in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study is to complete an analysis of the works of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig in order to determine the nature of his portrayal of the late sixteenth century woman in her social setting.

The examination of Heinrich Julius' plays focuses specifically upon his portrayal of the women in her diverse roles as daughter, wife, mother and lover, this examination being coupled with an analysis of the manner in which Heinrich Julius presents the role of the woman in marriage, adultery and self-destruction.

The analysis focussed upon the comedies Von einem Wirthe, Von Vincentio Ladislao, Von einem Weibe; upon the tragedies Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin, Von einer Ehebrecherin and Von einem vngeratenen Sohn and upon the two tragi-comedies comprising the plays based upon the Susanna theme.

The analysis permits the categorization of German women of the sixteenth century into four classes: virtuous married women; adulteresses; court 'ladies' and peasant women. Prime characteristics for ideal womanhood are deference and submission to God, husband and parents. The breakdown of a marriage is regarded as a fault of the woman and ultimately punishable by her death. Court ladies and townswomen are portrayed fairly well and with some insight, however the peasant women are portrayed in the least favourable light.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to thank the members of her committee, Drs. E. Egert, L. Fitz and E. Reinhold for constructive comments and suggestions relating to the thesis.

Special thanks for his constant encouragement, thoughtful and incisive advice and unstinting editorial and moral support throughout the gestation period of this thesis go to Dr. D. W. R. Wilson.

Finally my sincerest thanks go to my family whose personal support contributed immeasurably towards the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Brief Biography	1
Heinrich Julius and the English Comedians	5
The Role of the Woman in the 16th Century	9
Review of Related Literature	11
Purpose and Design of the Study	15
II. THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE COMEDIES	21
1. <u>Von einem Wirthe</u>	21
2. <u>Von Vincentio Ladislao</u>	24
3. <u>Von einem Weibe</u>	31
III. THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE TRAGEDIES	45
1. <u>Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin</u>	45
2. <u>Von einer Ehebrecherin</u>	64
3. <u>Von einem ungeratenen Sohn</u>	78
IV. THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE TRAGI-COMEDIES	85
Introduction	85
1. <u>Susanna</u> : Version A	87
2. <u>Susanna</u> : Version B	110
V. SUMMARY	117
REFERENCES	124

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Brief Biography

It is appropriate, before examining some of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig's works in greater detail, to provide an historical-biographical cameo in order to relate him to the context of the cultural, political and social milieu of the late 16th and early 17th centuries within which he lived and worked.

Heinrich Julius was born on October 16, 1564, the year of Shakespeare's birth, a time rife with sharp contrasts. A child of the tumultuous Reformation time (Werner, 1976:18), Heinrich Julius spent his first two years in the household of his individualistic and stern Catholic grandfather Heinrich. Within his own family we see the counterplay of two opposing, religious forces as epitomized by a grandfather fanatically battling for Catholicism while ensuring that the grandson would become the postulant of the Bishopric of Halberstadt in 1566, and by his father, an equally fanatic Protestant. With the death of the grandfather Heinrich in 1566, his son Julius assumed the governmental reins and immediately began to revitalize an economically exhausted country which had long been torn asunder by wars. At the same time and with great vigour he set about the introduction of Protestantism. Judicious attention to administration, however, did not prevent Julius from ensuring that his eldest son Heinrich Julius receive a thorough and meticulous education (Friedenthal, 1922:7, 9), one in which not only the "betonte protestantisch-religiöse Element" dominated, but one which also encompassed readings from Cicero, Caesar, Terenz, Plutarch and Aristotle, an education supplemented in addition

by the study of the French language. Heinrich Julius thus grew up in a family which corresponded to the Reformation ideal; "Der Vater ein biederer Patriarch, ein Freund des Einfachen, Schlichten und Ehrbaren" (Werner, 1976:18). In 1576 Heinrich Julius was made "Rektor Perpetuus" of the University of Helmstadt.

Despite the absence of papal confirmation, the Emperor's approval being considered sufficient, Heinrich Julius was installed as Bishop of Halberstadt in December 1578. Considerable Protestant reaction was engendered as a result of the essentially Catholic installation ceremony. At this time the young duke's household was transferred from Gandersheim to Gröningen, the Gröningen interlude being characterized by disagreements between Heinrich Julius and his father Julius, the latter often feeling it necessary to visit the son in order to admonish him for his rapidly developing reputation for excesses. In such excesses, however, he did not differ markedly from other members of contemporary society, a society which was characterized as a time of 'Verwilderung der Sitten' and a 'grobianische' time. Indeed, this state of affairs leads Werner (1976:20-21) to comment:

Die Spannung zwischen dem realistischen Tatbestand der Verwilderung der Sitten seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters, ... und dem reformatorischen Drang nach strengster Sittenreinheit ... ist ungeheuer gross und schafft jene Stimmung aufeinanderprallender Extreme, die bereits für Heinrich Julius ... bezeichnend ist.

All parental admonitions proved to be ineffectual until a threat of disinheritance was delivered. Only then did Heinrich Julius gradually begin to take an interest in the administration of the duchy.

Heinrich Julius' marriage to Dorothea, daughter of the Elector August of Saxony, on September 26, 1585, led to the adoption of a more

grandiose living style, a display of opulence which not only contributed to Heinrich Julius' unpopularity with the people but also foreshadowed the ultimate depletion of the national treasury. Upon Dorothea's death in February 1587, Julius made Heinrich Julius President of the Hofgericht in order to afford his son some distraction during his apparently genuine grief. It is felt that some of Heinrich Julius' troubles with the citizens of Brunswick stem from this time. With the death of Julius in 1589, Heinrich Julius was left, however, with a well-ordered, economically sound country to rule. High hopes were initially placed upon the young duke, but true to his previous behaviour, he soon proved to be a man of considerable harshness.

On April 19, 1590 he married Elizabeth, daughter of the late King Frederick II of Denmark, sister of Christian IV, and sister-in-law to James VI of Scotland. The return of the young couple to Brunswick ushered in a period of intense cultural activity in Wolfenbüttel - this was initiated by the splendid second marriage festivities at which the long version of Susanna may perhaps have been performed. Heinrich Julius now appeared to be at the height of his power and influence, for not only was he allied with Denmark and Scotland, but he also still had ties with the Elector of Saxony by virtue of his first marriage. His two marriages had thus placed him potentially in the position of becoming one of the most powerful of North German princes.

His greatest aspiration at this time appeared, however, to consist of playing patron *par excellence* of the arts. Not only did he gather many illustrious men, such as Caselius and Frischlin, around him, but he also invited foreign musicians and such notable groups as the English comedians under Thomas Sackville to his court. Such intense

and extensive cultural activity must have contributed ultimately to the rapid depletion of the financial reserves so carefully garnered and amassed by his father Julius.

Heinrich Julius' attempts to reform "the inns and innkeepers, and the butchers ... and to enforce better morals upon his subjects" (Knight, 1948:13) were coupled with his own conception of himself as absolute autocratic ruler. He may well have derived his conception of such a role and of the rights of a prince both from his thorough study of Roman jurisprudence and from his training in the Scriptures. It is generally agreed that his autocratic attitude was one of the chief causes of his continuing quarrel with the citizens of Brunswick who, as early as 1587, refused to continue offering him their allegiance. The quarrel, brewing since 1600, came to a head when Heinrich Julius laid siege to Brunswick in 1605, but despite this action he continued to be unsuccessful in securing the loyalty and allegiance of the people of Brunswick.

In about 1610 Heinrich Julius' thoughts turned towards a means of settling the affairs of his country, so he visited Prague, going there ostensibly to obtain a ruling from Emperor Rudolf regarding his dispute with Brunswick. Upon being appointed Director of the Privy Council of Rudolf's court, Heinrich Julius was henceforth able to extend his influence over all German affairs until the time of Rudolf's death in 1612. His own death followed a drinking bout with friends, as a result of a fever which he contracted and which brought about his demise on June 30, 1613.

According to Knight (1948:17) Heinrich Julius possessed talents greater and more varied than those of other princes of his time, and

"*mutatis mutandis*" he existed all over sixteenth and seventeenth-century Germany, in scores of states, under many names, now nearly all forgotten."

Heinrich Julius and the English Comedians

It is generally agreed that Heinrich Julius may have come into initial contact with the English comedians at the time of his sojourn in Denmark in 1590 (Friedenthal, 1922; Brüggenmann, 1926; Knight, 1948). Indeed, Knight (1948:11) suggests: "There can be little doubt that this meeting largely determined the form of his own dramatic work of the next years, even if it were not the origin of his dramatic ambitions."

1592 appears to be the earliest confirmed date of appearance of the English comedians at the Wolfenbüttel court - a court which had rapidly developed a reputation for cultural excellence. Friedenthal (1922:22) suggests that, in order to expand the repertoire of the English comedians, Heinrich Julius wrote "in rascher Folge ein Dutzend Dramen". Not only did his plays delight his audiences but they "wurden zum Teil auf den weiteren Zügen der Komödianten ... durch ganz Deutschland verbreitet". This statement is not generally corroborated by other critics, who tend to view Heinrich Julius' influence as being rather limited. Baesecke (1935:77), however, points out that Sackville performed two of Heinrich Julius' plays, in the German language, in Frankfurt a.M. in 1597.

A number of critics (Friedenthal, 1922; Holl, 1923; Brüggenmann, 1926; Baesecke, 1935; Newald, 1960; Emmrich, 1965) have also pointed to the considerable influence of the English comedians upon the plays of Heinrich Julius. Baesecke (1935:77), however, summarizes this influence best when she comments:

Heinrich Julius hat zwar an theatralischen Mitteln und Motiven und in Bezug auf die Schaffung lebendiger Bühnensituationen den EK sehr viel abgesehen, doch gewinnt in seinen Dramen immer wieder die behäbige Breite des deutschen Dramas der Zeit, die den EK so gar nicht eigen ist, die Oberhand.

How then did this influence manifest itself in Heinrich Julius' plays? It is generally agreed that the chief role in the plays performed by the English comedians was that of the clown. Holl (1923:88) appears to be the sole proponent of the erroneous view that the clown also played "die Hauptrolle in den Stücken des Herzogs". A more correct assessment of the clown's function in Heinrich Julius' plays is made by Brüllgemann (1926:10-11) who views the clown's role as a subordinate one because of his station/character. As a result of such 'subordination' the clown does not, as a rule, participate in the main plot, the resultant separation placing the clown in the unique position of providing the necessary connecting link between the players and the audience and, as the interconnecting link, acting in a capacity similar to that performed by a Greek chorus. This latter viewpoint is shared by Newald (1960:83), and indeed, both Brüllgemann (1926:7) and Newald (1960:83) concur that the clown's role is "Sachevill auf den Leib geschrieben worden". Brüllgemann (1926:7) even goes so far as to suggest that Heinrich Julius might have had

seine Stücke erst nur nach einem ganz allgemein gehaltenen Scenarium von den Komödianten improvisieren lassen und habe hernach erst bei der genauen schriftlichen Ausarbeitung der Stücke das Auftreten Sacheville, wie er es gesehen, und die Improvisationen dieses Darstellers, wie er sie aus dessen Munde vernommen hatte, schriftlich fixiert.

Another English influence is to be found in Heinrich Julius' use of prose rather than verse. Brüllgemann (1926) points out that Heinrich Julius is the only dramatist of his time who 'dares' to write in prose

(a necessity perhaps dictated by the fact that he was conscious of the limitations of verse in the dramatic genre).

In this context Holl (1923:88) praises Heinrich Julius' dramatic technique and skill in interweaving various themes and actions although Brüggemann (1926) takes Heinrich Julius to task for poor division of acts, generally clumsy construction, ponderous monologues and tiresome and innumerable repetitions. Baesecke (1935), however, sees such numerous repetitions as a necessary linking mechanism particularly favoured by the English comedians for the interconnection of various diverse situations. Werner (1976:213) goes on to point out that such repetitions used as "spannendes Moment in der Handlung" are a relatively "primitives Mittel der Effektsteigerung, das aus der Märchenerzählung bekannt ist ...". Newald (1960:83) shares Brüggemann's viewpoint regarding Heinrich Julius' predisposition towards use of cumbersome monologues and repeated recapitulations of the action.

Brüggemann (1926) and Newald (1960) view Heinrich Julius' naturalism, enhanced by the use of dialects, as yet another influence stemming from his association with the English comedians. Holl (1923:83), however, had previously pointed out that this use of dialect cannot be construed to be the direct result of contact with the English comedians, as it is well documented that the dramatic use of dialect (e.g. Frischlin) was known in Germany even before the documented arrival of the English players. Baesecke (1935:49) views language as a mimic means of expression which may consist not only of wilful misunderstandings (such as Iohan's misunderstanding of his master's word in Susanna (A) and Von einem Weibe), but also of the use of dialect and foreign language: "... das Mißverstehen und Wortverdrehen sind die geläufigsten

sprachlichen Betätigungen des Mimus in 'komischen Szenen'.

General agreement exists in the critical literature (Holl, 1923; Brüggemann, 1926; Baesecke, 1935; Newald, 1960; Emmrich, 1965) with regard to the English comedians' use of powerful theatrical effects in the graphical and visually effective portrayal of actions. In Brüggemann's (1926:29) words: "Man erschreckte lieber das Publikum durch Grausamkeit, als daß man es durch Furcht nur besorgt machte". Baesecke (1935) notes that such 'Affektausbrüche' may consist of hitting and/or stabbing someone (as we shall see in Heinrich Julius' Buler vnd Bulerin and Von einem ungeratenen Sohn) as well as laughter, crying and fearful shaking, as exemplified in portrayals of the fool as he laughs about the stupidity of his master or shakes with fear when verbally browbeaten by a peasant woman.

Baesecke (1935) also points to the frequent use made by the English comedians of such favoured dramatic theatrical devices as letters, rings, cutlery and musical instruments, use of such effects being exemplified in Vincentio Ladislao, Buler vnd Bulerin and in Ehebrecherin.

An additional English influence is seen in Heinrich Julius' choice of themes, themes for the most part taken directly from everyday life (Holl, 1923; Brüggemann, 1926; Newald, 1960). Indeed Brüggemann (1926:21) and Newald (1960:85) view Heinrich Julius' repeated choice of the cuckold and of the concomitant adultery theme as being nothing other than his use, as a main theme, of what the English comedians regarded as a diversion. Emmrich (1965:666), however, disagrees with this assessment. He contends that Heinrich Julius' repeated dramatization of the marital relationship between man and woman merely "... kennzeichnet die Bedeutung, die das Problem der individuellen Geschlechtsliebe in der Epoche

des Entstehens bürgerlicher Lebensformen gewonnen hatte".

The Role of the Woman in the 16th Century

It has been noted that toward the end of the Middle Ages German women were generally placed in a subordinate position and were often treated disdainfully, marriage itself having become debased and celibacy praised (Kawerau, 1892; Koebner, 1911; Gillet, 1918; Berent, 1967). Gillet (1918) concludes that this low view of woman's position in society undoubtedly received reinforcement from the Old Testament conception of woman, as temptress, luring man into marriage, an institution which was considered to be evil and undesirable.

This negative attitude towards woman is diametrically opposed to that of the Italian humanists and their theories of love, fostered by such writers as Dante and Petrarca, in which erotic love is held to be the natural result of man's desire for beauty. Furthermore such desire must ultimately lead to the Divine in which all human love begins and ends, and as feminine beauty is felt to be a mirror of divine beauty and because God unites truth and goodness within himself, it was concluded that feminine beauty could be regarded as an external expression of ultimate inner perfection (Berent, 1967). Berent continues by stating that such theories must logically lead to woman's emancipation from the dominion of man and such was the result in Italy. However, in the early 16th century, while the Italians were preoccupied with the many-faceted problem of love, Luther and his German devotees were engaged in combatting, among other things, the flagrant immorality and general laxness which had taken hold of the German clergy (Kawerau, 1892; Gillet, 1918; Berent, 1967; Werner, 1976). Luther, as none other,

recognized the irresistible power of erotic love (Gillet, 1918; Emmrich, 1965; Berent, 1967) and as a consequence, one of his prime objectives was to overcome the immorality of the clergy by attempting to legitimize erotic love within the parameters of marriage, an institution which he considered to be divinely decreed (Emmrich, 1965; Berent, 1967). Until Luther's time, marriage had been based upon economic necessity, a necessity which on the one hand saddled the husband with many responsibilities, and on the other, provided few joys. Although, as a consequence of the Reformation, marriage had received legitimacy, the role of the woman had not been altered substantially within its confines, for, in fact, Luther's conception of the woman's role basically perpetuated medieval attitudes. Gillet (1918:352) concludes that Luther's conception of the woman was not unfair in that Luther believed that "She who cares for her children, ... need ask no holier nor godlier state". Emmrich (1965) however, feels that no matter how great Luther's achievement may have been, it still left the woman in a subordinate position. Gillet's position (1918:352) that Luther showed "sincere appreciation of the spiritual relationship in marriage ..." is not reinforced by Berent (1967:25) who is motivated to conclude that Luther "war eben noch nicht in der Lage, seelische oder gar geistige Bereiche für die Liebesbeziehungen zu erschließen ...". In this matter Luther's achievement rests only in his removal of the sinful aspect of the erotic by placing it under the direct protection of God by circumscribing it with marriage.

The fact that Heinrich Julius dramatized his views on marriage and indicated the awful results of adultery directly in the three plays Von einem Weibe, Buler vnd Bulerin and Ehebrecherin, as well as

indirectly in the two Susanna versions, indicates that the marital relationship between man and woman was an issue of some considerable import to him. Emmrich (1965:667) points out that the marital bonds in each portrayal were sundered by the wife and of all of the women in the plays which treat of marriage, Susanna remains the only wife who emerges not only as a model of all feminine virtue (Tittmann, 1879) but also as the 'ethical ideal' of womanhood in the 'feudal-bourgeois society' (Emmrich, 1965). In Susanna, in which the marital relationship remains unimpeachable because the heroine withstands all attempts to make her break her marriage vows, the bourgeois protestant conception of marriage receives its ultimate 'artificial glorification' (Emmrich, 1965). Moreover Emmrich (1965:667) stresses that Heinrich Julius' ideological position is clearly identifiable:

er verteidigt die Ehe als gesellschaftliche
Institution ganz im Sinne der katechetischen
Vorschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen
Konfession und verurteilt jeglichen Versuch,
an den Grundfesten der bürgerlichen Moral
zu rütteln.

Review of Related Literature

Several literary analyses of Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig's works have been conducted over the past century. A number of these studies, while disagreeing over points of interpretation, nevertheless concur that Heinrich Julius' works have considerable historical merit (Tittmann, 1879; Friedenthal, 1924; Knight, 1948). Knight (1948), while vigorously refuting the erroneous impression that some critics have perpetuated concerning the 'bloodthirstiness' manifested in the plays,

proposes that Heinrich Julius is none other than the father of his country's drama, while Emmrich (1963: 1965) views Heinrich Julius' works as a transitional link in the evolutionary progression from folk drama to literary drama. Werner (1976:6) also views Heinrich Julius as dramatist working in a transitional period in that she sees in his works the "Züge vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit ...". Furthermore, Knight (1948) views the plays as being not only of social but also of historical interest in that they provide the mirror for viewing 'uncommon' and interesting times. In addition, Emmrich (1965:672) feels that the plays deal with "Gegenwartsprobleme aller Klassen der damaligen Gesellschaft".

The settings for the action of the plays are characteristically the street, the market place and the restaurant (Emmrich, 1963; 1965), basically ordinary places. Furthermore the tragedies, according to Knight (1937; 1948), present portraits of ordinary daily life, portraits in which ordinary people perpetrate common, ordinary sins; the characters swear, booze, cheat and whore, but despite the fact that they behave in a generally unedifying manner, they rarely display monstrous depravity. Werner (1976:7) views his characters as "Betrüger, Bösewichte, Impotente und Ehebrecher - Menschen im Verlust des Ideals".

Emmrich (1963; 1965) holds that Heinrich Julius' works can only be considered from a political-ideological viewpoint in that the Lutheran Duke recognized that acceptance of existing social relationships, appraised on the basis of the precepts of heavenly justice, could provide him with a new dramatic perspective which facilitated, at the same time, the analogy between the earthly absolute political state and the spiritual heavenly kingdom. Emmrich further concludes

that Heinrich Julius' thoughts and actions were necessarily determined by reasons of state, as both Church and State require the unconditional surrender of man, both to God's will and to the laws of the state. He goes on to suggest that Heinrich Julius therefore not only used the pulpit but also the stage in order to preach to his subjects. Knight (1937; 1948) reinforces this point of view by expressing the feeling that one of the tenets for Heinrich Julius' conception of tragedy is that it had to provide examples which underpin the dogmas and commandments of the Church. Both Knight (1937; 1948) and Emmrich (1963; 1965) agree that the principal objective of all of the plays was to persuade citizens of the duchy to shun immorality and they point out that in order to optimize achievement of this end Heinrich Julius used the prologues and the epilogues of his tragedies as vehicles for sermonizing. However, in a mildly dissenting analysis, Newald (1960) considers that Heinrich Julius was interested not so much in underpinning church dogmas as in the problem of the administration of justice and the issue of justice does indeed constitute a recurring theme in the plays (Tittmann, 1879; Newald, 1960; Werner, 1976)

The principal themes which concern Heinrich Julius, according to Knight (1937; 1948), are not only commonplace and crude but are also clumsy in their emphasis upon realism. While Holl (1923:91) contends that "mit Ausnahme der gelungenen Komödie des "Vincentius Ladislaus" sind die Stücke des Herzogs weniger auf beobachtender Erfahrung, als erlernter Tradition aufgebaut", Knight (1937:118) believes that Heinrich Julius' strength lies in his "Beobachtung des täglichen Lebens, im Reichtum eines groben Humors ... Im Verständnis für volkstümliche, aus dem Leben des Mittelstands und des Bauernstandes geschöpften Typen".

Werner (1976:50) succinctly summarizes the themes which Heinrich Julius treats in his tragedies as issues which concern "die sehr bürgerlichen Sünden der Geldgier und des Betruges, soweit es sich um Männer handelt, und um Ehebruch, sofern Frauen die Sünderinnen sind". Tittmann (1879) concludes that Heinrich Julius (in extending Frischlin's Susanna by inserting the lengthy peasant scenes) wished to illuminate and highlight the baseness of the two judges. Newald (1960) concurs with this viewpoint in that he feels that the strengths of Heinrich Julius' portrayals lie not so much in the characterization of the main persons but in the elaboration of the peasant scenes, which he utilizes in order to emphasize the unfairness of the judges. As already noted in another context, Newald (1960) considers that the general problem of justice was of considerable import to Heinrich Julius, a typical example of this being his treatment of the theme in the Fleischawer.

Recurring issues in the plays also revolve around the motifs of marriage and adultery. Emmrich (1965) feels that, in repeatedly thus choosing the same themes and materials, Heinrich Julius merely underscores ideas already expressed by Luther. Emmrich believes that the theme of adultery finds its roots in the attempts by woman to emancipate herself from the domination of her husband, since in all three plays which deal with this issue he suggests that it is the woman who breaks up the marriage. Werner (1976:59) believes that in repeatedly choosing the 'Ehebruchsthema' Heinrich Julius is attempting to demonstrate with examples "die zerstörte Weltordnung ... den Riss, der durch die Welt geht. Die Frau, die den Mann belügt, ... ist nicht nur Ehebrecherin im Sinne des Gesetzes sondern zugleich Zerstörerin der idealen Ordnung ..." and because she destroys this God-willed order, the female commits an

unpardonable sin, a sin punishable by death and damnation. Emmrich (1965) concurs with this latter viewpoint in that he believes that the woman who has sinned against the Holy Ghost has offended God by her actions and thus merits condemnation.

Despite his youthful excesses, Heinrich Julius in his role as dramatist treated relationships between the sexes from an extremely moralistic viewpoint and freely dispenses a heavenly retribution in his plays for those crimes for which his courts were powerless to dispense justice (Tittmann, 1879). If the just punishment for adultery is to be regarded as death or madness, then the marriage vows must surely be honoured and marriage must be idealized if life and sanity are valued. Kawerau (1892), Koebner (1911), Gillet (1918), Emmrich (1965) and Berent (1967) all indicate that such was not always the case.

A detailed analysis and study of Heinrich Julius' works as they relate to woman generally, and to woman in a marriage situation specifically can thus be justified in that such a study can contribute towards a greater appreciation of "ein lebendiges und in vieler Hinsicht kulturhistorisch sehr bedeutungsvolles Bild von den Ansichten und Gebräuchen ihres Zeitalters ..." (Knight, 1937:119). This latter view was propounded as early as 1879 by Tittmann, who, in his introduction to Heinrich Julius' works suggested, even at that time, that the latter's plays are of "culturgeschichtliches und literarhistorisches Interesse ..." (xxxii).

Purpose and Design of the Study

Heinrich Julius wrote his plays during a time spanning the interval between the religious upheaval of the Reformation and the social upheaval

of the Thirty Years' War. It was a seemingly peaceful time but one, nevertheless, characterized by the display of a dichotomy of viewpoints with regard to sexual freedom and excesses, and with regard to a general moral decline on the one hand and a heightened awareness of the importance of the role of the woman coupled with increased emphasis on the respectability of marriage, on the other. In these aspects we may consider the closing years of the 16th century to be similar to the closing decades of the 20th. To a significant degree we are also living at a time of upheaval, a time of wars between nations and between the sexes. In the sixties and seventies of the 20th century woman's awareness of herself has increased and she has become alerted to the possibility of the adoption of life-styles different from those dictated to her by society over the last four hundred years. On the one hand marriage is being praised and is slowly regaining its former status of respectability, while on the other, the divorce rate continues to rise.

Thus, in view of the recent intense and extensive discussion and proliferation of writings regarding woman's role and her emancipation, a re-examination of Heinrich Julius' works would seem to be appropriate at this point. The primary purpose of this study is to complete an analysis of the works of Heinrich Julius in order to determine the nature of his portrayal of the late 16th century German woman in her social setting. Specifically an examination of his portrayal of the woman in her role as a) daughter, b) wife, c) mother and d) lover will be carried out together with an analysis of the manner in which Heinrich Julius presents the role of the woman in a) marriage, b) adultery and c) self-destruction. In addition, interactions between the sexes will

be categorized on the basis of the way in which they show active or passive kinds of behaviour on the part of the woman.

The study will be limited to an analysis of those published plays which contain roles specifically assigned to women: a) Von einem Weibe; b) Von Vincentio Ladislao; c) Von einem Wirthe; d) Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin; e) Von einer Ehebrecherin; f) Von einem vngeratenen Sohn; and g) the two Susanna versions.

It is generally conceded (Brüggemann, 1926; Knight, 1948; Emmrich, 1963; Werner, 1976) that Heinrich Julius possessed only the most rudimentary knowledge of the basics of the three dramatic genres: tragedy, tragi-comedy and comedy, because the classification of his plays into any one of these categories appears to depend primarily upon the outcome of the play or its ending. In this he follows the classification of his time. Indeed, Emmrich (1963:218-219) believes that Heinrich Julius "faßte die Gattungsbegriffe schablonenhaft auf" because his presentation of the "Verhältnis des Tragischen und Komischen [läßt uns] unbefriedigt". However, because Heinrich Julius presented essentially similar conflicts in both a 'comic' and a 'tragic' fashion Emmrich (1963) indicates that:

er mit seinem Scharfblick für die gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse der Zeit eine Beziehung zwischen Tragischem und Komischem ahnte. Er vermochte allerdings nur, ihr in schematischer Weise Ausdruck zu verleihen.

For example, Heinrich Julius' tragedies such as Buler vnd Bulerin and Ehebrecherin, are in essence nothing other than comedies, which because of their abrupt, somewhat incongruent and calamitous ending, are termed 'tragedies'.

Werner (1976:191) points out that:

hinsichtlich der ~~Äusseren~~ Form und dem Genre bleibt Heinrich Julius im Rahmen dessen, was in seiner Zeit üblich war. Die Bezeichnung Tragoedie, Comedia usw. entspricht der Erklärung, die der zeitgenössische Verfasser einem Werke Von einem ungerechten Richter voranstellte ...

Heinrich Julius thus did not deviate from the contemporary viewpoint of 'tragedy' and of 'comedy'. Indeed on the basis of this prologue as cited by Holland (1867:813)

Lieber Leser, damit dir der vnterscheidt zwischen, Tragoedien vnd Comoedien, wissent sey, vnd desto verstehen mügest, ... so soltu wissen, das Tragoe-
dia ein Spiel ist, welchs einen bösen erschreck-
lichen Ausgang gewinnet, Comoedia aber hergegen, da
das Spiel zu einem guden vnd fröhlichen ende kömmt, ...

Werner (1976:191) concludes that:

Das trifft nun zwar für Heinrich Julius' Dramen
durchaus zu, klingt aber für unsere Ohren unge-
mein ~~Äusserlich~~ und wird fragwürdig, wenn man
sich überlegt, ob denn z.B. das Ende in Von
einem Weibe wirklich einen guten und fröhlichen
Ausgang hat.

Although the anonymous author of Von einem ungerechten Richter simply considers the ending of the play to be the determining factor with respect to categorization of the play, Knight (1948:36) views the content to be of prime importance.

Brüggemann's analysis (1926:22) led him to conclude that in the tragedies Heinrich Julius presented the "Mensch, der vom Wege der herkömmlichen Moral abweicht, nicht ungestraft davonkommt sondern untergeht und durch seinen schrecklichen Untergang moralisch erschüttert". This concept is taken up by Knight (1948:36), who concludes that Heinrich Julius simply thought of tragedy as a play which must have either a catastrophic or an unhappy ending. He finds further that of Heinrich Julius' four tragedies (the Fleischauer is

excluded from our examination) "all end with the ruin, death and damnation of the principal character or characters, whom the devil *in propria persona* carries away to hell". According to Knight (1948:36), Heinrich Julius felt that the death alone of the principals constituted an inadequate basis for tragedy, their damnation also being required because damnation "is the fate against which tragedy serves as a warning ..."

According to Knight (1946:164), Heinrich Julius' tragi-comedies appear to consist of a "play betwixt and between, one in which, throughout or at some crucial point ... a disastrous ending seems to impend, but, ... is narrowly averted". An additional distinguishing feature of a tragi-comedy appears to be the fact that although the sinners are to be condemned and may suffer a terrible end (such as that of Midian and Simeon) they are not 'gathered to the bosom' of the devil in perpetuity. However, even if the tragi-comedies are 'betwixt and between', Knight (1946:164, 176) feels that the three tragi-comedies are dissimilar in that the two versions of Susanna are essentially didactic and deeply religious whereas the Gastgeber is predominantly farcical. An artificial linkage by title only does not automatically place these plays into an unique and separate genre.

If, on the one hand, as the critical literature suggests, Heinrich Julius did not formulate a theory of tragedy, nor, on the other, does he seem to have set out a theoretical basis for his comedies. The prime distinguishing mark for his 'comedies' appears to be that the ending must be happy. Furthermore, the comedies show greater variability than the tragedies in that the former

pursue widely disparate themes and are devoid of either prologue or epilogue, devices which in association with the tragedies permitted Heinrich Julius to expound his moral viewpoint. The fool alone, Heinrich Julius' raissonneur, has the last word.

The following three chapters will, in sequence, submit the comedies, the tragedies and the tragi-comedies, in so far as they treat the role of the woman, to a detailed analysis, an analysis which will then be summarized by a brief concluding statement.

Chapter 2

THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE COMEDIES

This chapter will examine three of Heinrich Julius' comedies: 1)

COMOEDIA HIDBELAHA. Von einem Wirthe, wie derselbige von dreyen Wandergesellen drey Mahl vmb die Bezahlung betrogen sey worden; 2) COMOEDIA HIDBELEPIHAL. Von Vincentio Ladislao Sacrapa von Mantua Kempffern zu Rosz vnd Fuesz, Weiland des Edlen vnd Ehrnuesten, auch Manhafften vnnd Streitbaren Barbarossae Bellicosi von Mantua, Rittern zu Malta Ehelichen Nachgelassenen Sohn, and 3) COMEDIA HIDBELEPIHAL. Von einem Weibe, Wie dasselbe jhre Hurerey für jhrem Eheman verborgen.

1) Von einem Wirthe

In Von einem Wirthe, published in 1593, Heinrich Julius portrays the manner in which an innkeeper's greediness and gullibility are 'repaid' by three cunning wandering fellows.

The female roles in this play are restricted to the peasant women Walpe, Greth and Lena - each of whom is given a brief scene in which she becomes the verbal sparring partner of the servant Iohan Bousett. Each of these scenes, it should be noted, represent but interludes within the main plot and, as such, do not contribute significantly to the action. Iohan is sent to the market by his master the 'Gastgeber' in order to buy the items necessary for the maintenance of the activities of the inn and the requirements of its guests, the latter consisting at the time of the three sly 'Wandergesellen' who are out to trick the innkeeper. Iohan encounters the three peasant women as he sets about complying with his master's instructions.

After he has tried to obtain items from some peasant men, Iohan comes

upon Walpe, whose whole appearance on stage is limited to eight lines of dialogue. Iohan thinks that Walpe may have a "Vogel ... tho vorkopen..." (III, 2:316). Walpe's polite "Wuas es dein beger?" (III, 2:316) results from her inability to comprehend Iohan's dialect, her query being countered by Iohan's retort: "Ich sal Vogel begeren" (III, 2:316). Walpe's subsequent comments are but variations upon her somewhat perplexed: "Ech verstie es nech wuas du suast" (III, 2:316). Her lack of understanding leads her to believe: "Der Kerl muas iuo doll sein ... Ech wel von jhme weg gien" (III, 2:316). Walpe, although being accustomed in all likelihood to strange sights, prefers to place some distance between herself and this strange apparition in 'nerrische Kleider'. It is apparent that those whom one does not understand are to be considered somewhat suspect and are thus to be avoided.

Iohan's subsequent interchange with Greth ends as inconclusively as his encounter with Walpe. Pointing to the goose Greth is carrying, Iohan asks: "Ick frag wat ick aw vor dat Gauß, dat ghy up de Rügge draget geffen soude" (IV, 6:324). Greth misconstrues Iohan's intentions and retorts sharply:

Lat mich de Goß vngekiet, Dat is mine Goß, Dat
dick nümmer gaut geschey, Wultu eine heffen so
schaffe dick eine, vnd heffe den Dñuel dartho. (IV, 6:324)

From this it becomes obvious that Greth is not prepared under the circumstances to part with the goose. Iohan's persistence in obtaining the goose for which his master has sent him is to no avail, despite the fact that he is willing to pay for it: "Hörstu ick wol du lose Schelm, dat du mick bliuen latest, vnnd brñle darken dar tho donde hast, vnd lath mich ock miner wege gahn" (IV, 6:324). Greth, being little disposed to bargain with such an odd stranger, begins to suspect that Iohan may have

ulterior motives. At this point she simply wants to keep the goose and to be allowed to go her own way in peace. This leads Iohan to laugh at her: "... Dat moth ein bister Frow syn, ick sou ihr gelt geuen vor dat Gans, Ende sie meinet, ick wilt se ehr nehmen" and to deliver the verdict: "Si ein moth niet klock sin" (IV, 6:324). It does not occur to him that his own dialect may be the reason for the misunderstanding.

The next woman to appear, Lena, is heralded by the comment: "... dar komt noch ein Frouw, met ein roth mltz ..." (IV, 6:325). Iohan appears to be convinced that the woman is a 'Doctors Frow', since "se hat ein roth mltz up ihr Kop" (IV, 6:325). Whether or not she is a doctor's wife may be subject to debate; however, one thing is certain, the woman appears to suffer from a vicious temper. So much so that Iohan's perfectly reasonable request is countered by such yelling in reply: "Wat es dieck, Dat dieck de kraigen Henger hale, Du heilose ohnmechtige seicke Pracher" (IV, 7:325) that Iohan 'zittert'. The seemingly unmotivated and irrational outburst by Lena, the 'Doctors Frow', permits Iohan to conclude: "... Et mach wal des Duifels Fraw sin" (IV, 7:325). Both Greth and Lena seem to have misunderstood Iohan's intentions as Lena indicates that: "... Lath meck vngehyet, Dat dieck de quade flegende Geist int lieff vare" (IV, 7:325). With this renewed unwarranted verbal onslaught, Iohan is reduced to exclaiming: "Behüde mey Godt, Dat is ein bßs Fraw" (IV, 7:325). Lena, in threatening that she would hit Iohan "balde mit dem Knüppel vp den Kop" (IV, 7:325), leaves him visibly perturbed: "O ick bin so sehr vorfehrt van dat Frow, Behüdt Godt, Dat moth ein bßs Fraw syn" (IV, 7:325). Heinrich Julius portrays a typical aggressive peasant woman in this short interchange - a very negative image in fact, in view of the fact that Lena's viciousness is completely unpro-

voked and unmotivated. It is little wonder that Iohan readily concludes that she is a 'böös Fraw'.

It is of interest to note that Iohan applies the term 'böös' to Lena in much the same manner that Ioseph and Gallichoraea use the term with respect to their wives Dina and Scortum as we shall see in Chapter 3. However, Gallichoraea considers his wife Scortum to be 'böös' because of her suspected adulterous behaviour, while Ioseph believes his wife to be 'böös' because of the insults which she directs at him and as a result of her physical attack upon his person. Lena, like Scortum is also categorized as being 'böös', not only because she shouts vehemently at Iohan but also because she threatens to attack him. 'Böösheit' is thus apparently to be regarded as a characteristic not only of those women who impugn their husband's honour by their scandalous behaviour, but also a characteristic of those who physically and/or verbally abuse their men.

Women, as revealed in the three short scenes in which they appear in Von einem Wirthe, are portrayed very negatively. Heinrich Julius indicates that the three peasant women lack any manifestation of sympathy and understanding and that they are not only suspicious and unnecessarily aggressive, but are also somewhat stupid, Iohan characterizing them as such. In addition, as peasant women they not only show little manifestation of refinement - which, however, one might not really expect - but they are made to use language as coarse as that of their menfolk, a feature of the play which detracts further from their femininity.

2) Von Vincentio Ladislao

The comedy Von Vincentio Ladislao, published in 1594, has been the

focal point of alternating praise and condemnation in the critical literature for many years. Brüggemann (1926:48) considers it to be no more than a 'burleske Komödie' which, when compared with Von einer Ehebrecherin, is "doch nur ein Posse, um nicht zu sagen eine Clownerie". He goes on to conclude (52) that although Heinrich Julius obviously and successfully strove "nach einer Vervollkommung seiner dramatischen Kunst" the "'Vincentius Ladislaus' bedeutet dagegen deren vollen Verfall". Knight (1948:73), however, disagrees with Brüggemann's viewpoint in that he feels that, with Vincentio, Heinrich Julius attempted something much more complicated and original:

He is satirizing, in a far more delicate form than he had yet attempted, a particular form of absurdity ... against [which] he is attempting to erect a new ideal, the ideal of courtly and 'civilized' behaviour ...

Knight (1948:83) goes on to conclude that:

Vincentius Ladislaus, indeed, is a notable achievement ... the execution of the plan is as satisfactory as the plan itself ... Heinrich Julius wrote ... one of the best of all German comedies of any age. ... this one has deep social and cultural implications, heralding and betokening a new view of life as well as of art.

Knight (1948:84) not only feels that the play differs from the others in that its theme centers upon the ridiculing of a particular form of eccentricity, but he goes on to speculate that it also seems to be founded on the experiences of a living model: "It seems to me highly probable that ... Heinrich Julius had actually met a braggart eccentric soldier-turned-fencing-master such as Vincentius Ladislaus is". If, however, Knight initially appears to praise the play, he subsequently mitigates that praise by asserting that the play shows certain sinister overtones in its ending, viewing the ending as a portrayal of the dismissal by the

state of a no longer useful individual. He concludes (87) that:

This particular kind of cruel, sinister, ominous, or potentially ominous element looms much larger in modern German literature, and presumably in the modern German intelligence, than in that of any other country ...

A not surprising viewpoint coming as it does so shortly after the conclusion of the hostilities of World War II, perhaps giving us an interesting opportunity to speculate that we should view all literary criticism within the context of the temporal, social and political milieu from which it emerges.

Burger (1968:65), in discussing the considerable variation in the nature of the critical evaluation of the 'quality' of Vincentio Ladislao, goes on to state that the 'szenische Technik' is much greater in this play than in any of Heinrich Julius' other plays. He predicates his assertion on the fact that he sees in Vincentio Ladislao "eine doppelte Bewegung, ein Hin und Zurück, durch das der Handlungsablauf Kontinuität erhält" (70). Not only does Burger recognize a certain continuity in the action but he is also cognizant of the fact that the division of the acts constitutes a 'durchdachte Symmetrie'.

The three female characters listed in the 'Personae Comoediae' of Vincentio Ladislao are even more abbreviated. Indeed Angelica, the object of Vincentius' sudden and unexpected passion, and Rosina, are listed as being 'Jungfrauen, aber mutae Personae'. Even Eleonora, the duke's wife, is allotted the very briefest of speaking parts and, furthermore, is not as clearly delineated a character as Patientia. In short, women in this comedy play but minor roles, and their appearance is used mainly to underscore Vincentius' eccentricity.

The first four acts of Vincentio Ladislao deal mainly with the introduction of the main character Vincentius and with the subsequent action as it alternates between Vincentius' lodgings and the palace. Having afforded us the opportunity of indulging ourselves in Vincentius' peculiarities over the space of four acts, Heinrich Julius finally introduces women into the play at the beginning of the fifth act with the arrival of the duke's wife and her lady-in-waiting: "Inmittelst kömpt des Hertzogen Gemahlin mit jhrem Frawenzimmer" (V, 1:532). It is interesting to note that the arrival of the two women is accorded just about as much weight as the subsequent arrival of the food: "... vnd lesset auch der Marschalck das Essen aufftragen" (V, 1:532). Courtly manners and propriety, however, require that the guest of honour must greet the hostess prior to dining, Duke Silvester reminding Vincentius of his manners by asking him: "... Her Oberster, Gehet hin zu meiner Gemahlin, Vnd gebet derselben erstlich die Handt" (V, 1:532). The actual fulfillment of this requirement is indicated by means of stage directions which call upon Vincentius to go to "der Hertzogin vnd dem Frawenzimmer vnd gibt jhnen nach der reige mit grosser Reuerentz vnd höfflichkeit auff seine arth die Handt" (V, 1:533). Courtly custom apparently dictates that not only must the duke's wife be permitted to sit at the head table but also that her lady-in-waiting must sit at a side table. As the stage directions indicate: "Vincentius Ladislaus ... stehet auff ... vnnd sihet sich allenhandt vmb nach dem neben Tisch, da die Jungfrawen sitzen ..." (V, 2:533).

Vincentius' ridiculous capering upon this occasion leads one of the ladies to laugh at him, but so consumed is Vincentius by a sense of his

own importance, that he immediately becomes convinced that the lady loves him! "... Wie er die Jungfraw lachen sihet, ziehet er sich in den sinn, Sie habe jhn lieb, vnd gewinnet sie wieder lieb, vnd schielet allwege nach dem Tische, wo sie sitzt" (V, 2:533). Such an assertion leads Burger (1968:77) to conclude that "... die erwähnte Intrige ... eine für den Typ des Maul- und Frauenhelden unerläßliche Liebesaffäre, die aber - für das Publikum durchschaubar - [ist] von vornherein nicht mehr ... als ein Hirngespinnst des Helden ..." and as such, it ends in no more than a 'Posse', moreover a silent one, in the final act.

At this point in the action Heinrich Julius resorts once more to elaborate stage directions:

... Nach diesem Tantzet er mit der Jungfrawn,
vnd stellet sich gar freundlich im Tantzen mit
geberden gegen die Jungfrawen, Sie mercket, das
er mit einem Hasen schwanger gehet, Lächlet jhn
derowegen an, da meint er nicht anderst, sie
habe jhn lieb, vnd brllstet sich gewaltiglich ... (V, 4:543)

As Vincentius' dancing partner loses her handkerchief - whether deliberately or by accident remains unspecified - "ist er stracks da hebet denselben eilendt mit grosser Reuerentz auff vnd gibt jhr denselben wieder" (V, 4:543). Although it had initially been difficult to assess whether the 'Jungfraw' who laughed at Vincentius (V, 2:533) is the same as she with whom he attempted to demonstrate his dancing virtuosity (V, 4:543), it becomes clear, as the duchess retires with her ladies to her chambers, that the object of Vincentius' newly perceived ardor is the lady Angelica.

Vincentius now attempts to persuade Duke Silvester to act as an intermediary between Angelica and himself, for Vincentius, with considerable alacrity and facility, has made up his mind that Angelica

is the only woman suitable to be his wife:

Vnd ist nun an deme, Das wir aus angeborner vnnnd
eingepflantzter grosser liebe vnnnd trew dermassen
vnser Hertz gegen der schönen Angelica in liebe
entbrent, Das wir auch auff Erden keine ander zu
vnser Ehegemahel vnd Bettgenossen begeren, als
eben dieseibe. (V, 5:544)

This feeling has been generated because he has noticed that the lady has also "ein sonderlich Hertz gefasset, vnd ein Aug auff uns geworfen ..." (V, 5:544) - a circumstance which would appear to him to augur well for his cause. Instead of advising Vincentius against his intended course of action, Silvester subtly encourages this latest 'aberration' by indicating that he has also noticed that the lady reciprocated Vincentius' love. As a result, Silvester promises not only to discuss the matter with his wife, but in order to ensure that Angelica believe him Silvester also requests that Vincentius give him "ein Zeichen ... das ich jhr zeigen könne, Sonsten sollte sie wol meinen, ich spottete jhrer" (V, 5:545). Vincentius is overjoyed that the Duke should be willing to take up his cause and presents him with a ring which is to be handed to the lady as a token of his sincerity.

We soon discover that not only do Silvester and his wife consider Vincentius to be nothing other than a 'Narr' but that they also intend to play a practical joke on him. As Silvester informs his wife of Vincentius' request he suggests that, since Vincentius is a fool, "So schade es auch nicht, das man jhn ein wenig Tommelt ..." (VI, 1:547). This 'Tommeln' would be initiated by reinforcing Vincentius' belief that the lady Angelica returns his love, the deception to be achieved by sending Vincentius a forged letter in which 'Angelica' supposedly accepts Vincentius' proposal. Eleonora, in anticipation of the potential amusement to be gained from this jest, is nevertheless concerned that it could

give rise to a 'Bßs geschrey' about the lady in question. Her concern for her lady-in-waiting is but momentary in that she agrees to the Marshalk's plan at once when she learns that he intends to drop Vincentius into a bucket of water at the instant at which he is about to consummate his 'marriage'. 'Marriage' indeed, for the duke and his wife propose nothing other than to have a mock marriage, in which the bride will be played by a young boy.

The actual stage appearance of Eleonora is of the briefest duration and one is left with the feeling that neither she nor her lady-in-waiting are portrayed with a great amount of sympathy. Indeed, as the duke's wife and first lady of the land, Eleonora should have maintained her dignity by refusing to agree to participate in such a shameful practical joke upon one of her subjects. One may feel certain that Patientia would never have demeaned herself to such an extent by consenting to such a scheme. It may be one thing to call someone a fool behind his back, but it is quite another to condone and assist in his exposure to public ridicule. Despite the fact that Eleonora shows some concern for Angelica's reputation, one comes to the inevitable conclusion that Eleonora is as heartless and thoughtless as the instigator of the plan for Vincentius' public embarrassment, her husband.

The plot begins to unravel according to Silvester's plan with his announcement to Vincentius that "Die Jungfraw hat den Ring angenommen, Vnd will euch schriftlich antworten" (VI, 3:548). Indeed, when a page delivers the forged letter, Vincentius is transported into seventh heaven:

Machet den Brief, inn welchem ein Schnuptuch gemacht,
auff, Sihet nach dem Namen, Wie er nun Angelicam darin

findet, Küsset er den Brief, schlegt an die Brust,
hüpfet vor freuden auff, vnd spricht: Angelica, O
Angelica Du schönest auff Erden. (VI, 4:552)

Little does the unsuspecting Vincentius realize the hoax being perpetrated upon him. He is so delighted with his good fortune that he not only 'küsset den Schnuptuch' but "Repetirt etzliche mal jhren Namen, schlegt an die Brust, hüpfet wie ein Aff, vnd stellet sich gar manierlich an" (VI, 4:552). Silvester's promise of a 'kurtze lustige Hochzeit' turns, however, into a shambles: "Die Braut bringt man auch vnd setzet die auff das Bett, Darnach setzt man Vincentium auch ins Bette, Vnd wie er meinet, er sitze zum allerbesten, fellet er in die Blütte mit Wasser ..." (VI, 5:553). Dripping from his unexpected bath, Vincentius suddenly comprehends that he has received a 'Korb'.

3) Von einem Weibe

In the comedy Von einem Weibe, published in 1593, Heinrich Julius turned for the first time to the theme of the cuckolded husband, a theme to which he returned later in the two tragedies of Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin (1593) and Von einer Ehebrecherin (1594). Brüggemann (1926:22) considered Von einem Weibe to be the first of the three 'cuckold' plays and surmised that Heinrich Julius must have felt that comedy was an inadequate vehicle for treating a serious theme:

Der Versuch mit diesem ersten Hahnreidrama mußte dem Herzog zeigen, daß es Dinge gab, die in der Komödie keine ausreichende Lösung erfuhren, und die doch gerade als dramatisches Problem sein besonderes Interesse heraus fordern mußten.

Brüggemann (1926:25) went on to say that the wife's deceit, although graphically portrayed, "Bildet viel weniger den Gegenstand der Darstell-

ung als der Umstand, wie sich der Mann von ihr betrügen läßt. Das Thema des Stückes ist nicht der Betrug der Frau, sondern die Leichtgläubigkeit des Mannes". This viewpoint was subsequently shared by Knight (1948:75), who also considered this play to be "to a great extent a comedy of credulity ...". Werner (1976:104), however, disagreed with both Brüggemann's and Knight's assessments, stating that "in Von einem Weibe liegt der Hauptakzent auf der Schlaueit und Verschlagenheit der Frau". How then did Heinrich Julius portray such cunning and subtlety in a 'comic' fashion?

In Von einem Weibe, Thomas Mercator, having decided to travel in order to sell his wares, seeks leave from his wife Meretrix. Meretrix is apparently in a somewhat plaintive mood, as she remonstrates over her husband's intended trip: "Ach lieber Man, Wollet jhr dann nun abermal von mir ziehen, vnd mich so allein lassen" (I, 2:264), an expression of 'concern' similar to that which Scortum manifests for Gallichoraea in Von einer Ehebrecherin as we shall see on page 68. Indeed, it appears that both Meretrix and Scortum have been cast from the same mold.

From Meretrix' comments it is obvious that the husband's business necessitates his absence from home for a good portion of the time. By skilful questioning, Meretrix elicits information from her husband regarding his destination and the intended length of his absence. We may interpret such wifely concern in three ways: Meretrix may be anxious and worried about her husband's intended departure, she may sincerely resent her husband's numerous trips, or she may hardly be able to contain her impatience until his departure. However, in view of the fact that Heinrich Julius' stage directions call for Meretrix' public demonstration of her affection by 'embracing' her husband on three separate occasions

within this short scene, coupled with her expressed concern and recommendation to him to have his bad eye attended to whilst in the city, we may legitimately conclude that all is well with the marriage. But is it? When we contrast such loving concern with the full title of the play, we are immediately aware of the dramatic irony inherent in this domestic scene. The inappropriateness of such a positive deduction is clearly demonstrated immediately after the husband's departure. Meretrix' remarks at this point (II, 1) leave us in little doubt that she is deliberately hoodwinking her husband: "Mein Man ist nicht daheim ... Wanns doch nur mein Bule möchte wissen ..." (II, 1:266). We have now been given unmistakable indications by the wife that the husband is being cuckolded and know that the happiness which Thomas Mercator feels in his marriage is unwarranted. We perceive that the husband suffers not only from partial physical blindness but also apparently from almost total mental blindness as well.

In Act II, scene 1, Heinrich Julius delineates the peculiar relationship which exists between Meretrix and her 'Bule', the purely sexual relationship between the two lovers seeming to be predicated largely upon the, to us almost incredible, basis of Meretrix' obsession for the name 'Thomas' - both husband and lover having this same first name! That Meretrix loves her 'Bule' Thomas Amator because of this coincidence in name seems to be indicated by her statement: "Ach lieber Thomas, Ich habe euch so hertzlich lieb vmb eweres Namens willen ... jhr heisset Thomas, Und mein Man heisset auch also" (II, 1:266). However, her ambivalence regarding both husband and lover is clearly shown in her subsequent statement: "... Wenn mein Man Tod were, so wolte ich keinen lieber haben dann euch" (II, 1:267), a paradoxical admission

for her to make - for she seems to be saying that although she loves her lover because he has the same name as her husband, nevertheless, she loves her husband more! On one hand she benefits from the respectability, the security and the financial advantage which accrue to her by virtue of her marriage, while on the other hand, the nature of her husband's profession and his necessary attention to his daily 'erwerben' permit her the freedom of having a lover with whom she can have 'frischen muth'. A comparison of Meretrix and Scortum (Von einer Ehebrecherin) led Werner (1976:90) to the correct conclusion that the woman is "abgestempelt als routinierte und gewohnheitsmäßige Ehebrecherin, die sich schnell mit jedem Mann einlässt ..." Heinrich Julius has thus not deviated from the 16th century conception of the adulteress. Amator the lover provides Meretrix with sexual gratification, the husband provides her with her material needs and social stability.

The wife's enjoyment of her dalliance with her lover appears to come under some threat when her husband, through Gedeon the barber, learns of his wife's infidelity. Although Thomas Mercator is but a 'Junger Ehemann', rumours regarding his wife's scandalous behaviour are already rife in the city:

... Es ist an deme, das von ewer Frawen allhier
inn der Stadt ein böses geschrey erschollen. ...
Man saget, wenn jhr aus dem Hause gehet, so gehet
ein ander wieder ein. (II, 3:270)

Mercator is shocked by Gedeon's revelations, since he himself had not noticed his wife's supposed shameless behaviour:

Dann ich habe, so lange ich mein Weib gehabt,
dergleichen an jhr nicht gespürt, Sondern sie
hat sich allzeit mit Worten vnd Geberden so
gegen mich erzeiget, das ich wol habe mit jhr
zufrieden sein können. (III, 2:272)

Reluctant to accept the fact that his 'Fraw sey nicht dichte', as every-

one else 'knows', Mercator attempts to have his newly acquired suspicions verified by questioning his neighbour Adrian. At this point it seems that Meretrix has proven to be as accomplished a schemer – to the extent that not even the neighbour Adrian has noticed anything out of the ordinary (although, rather strangely and inconsistently for the plot, the rest of the town has). Confessing as much surprise at the news as Mercator, Adrian suggests that Mercator should try to discover if there is any truth in the rumour by attempting to catch his wife with her lover *in flagrante delicto* by returning home unannounced and earlier than expected. This stratagem would enable him either to confirm or to allay any suspicion that he might have as a result of Gedeon's news. Mercator takes his neighbour's advice and, ordering his servant to silence, attempts to entrap his wife. Mercator appears to be more astute in this latter endeavor than either Ioseph or Gallichoraea, the other cuckolds we shall encounter on pages 55, 70. The latter two, hoping to surprise their wives *in flagrante delicto*, give them ample warning on each such occasion by knocking on the door of their house. In contrast, Mercator, although in only a mildly sceptical frame of mind, shows more cleverness than either Ioseph or Gallichoraea in that he clearly admonishes his servant to maintain silence as they approach the house.

Despite her initial consternation upon the unexpected return of Mercator, Meretrix retains clear presence of mind as she dexterously manages a delicate situation consisting of her husband as he approaches the house on the one hand and a gibbering and badly frightened lover on the other. Cursing the untimely return of her husband – "Das ist mein Man, Wo fñhret den der Teuffel bereit wider her?" (IV, 2:272) – she turns to quieten and pacify her frightened lover: "Ey rufft so nicht, das er

euch nur nicht höre. Seid zu frieden, es sol kein noth haben" (IV, 2: 272). Retaining full control of what otherwise could prove to be a disastrous and explosive situation, she orders her cowardly lover to conceal himself as she strides forth to meet her husband.

Using the ruse of trying to verify a 'wunderlichen Traum' which she apparently has had regarding her husband's blind eye, Meretrix cleverly persuades the unsuspecting Mercator to try to see out of his bad eye, and thus provides her lover with the necessary opportunity to escape. Her objective achieved, she first feigns sorrow at Mercator's continued inability to see out of the eye and then takes her own leave in the guise of a woman attending to her wifely household duties. It remains for Iohan Bouset the servant to comment correctly upon his master's stupidity:

Iesus welch ein Sott is min Herr ... Min Here
mient, hey sal gar wal daran ... Vnd wet niet,
dat hey so schendlich bedrogen is. (V, 1:276)

Mercator naively informs his wife of the rumours he has heard regarding her scandalous behaviour and airs his disbelief, sorrow and shock: "... Du wollest zu solchem Gerüchte ferner kein vrsach geben, Vnd mich in betrübnis vnd Bekümmerniß setzen" (V, 2:277) - a somewhat mild rebuke under the circumstances. In a consummate act of deceit, Meretrix 'heulet vnd weinet' and convinces her husband that "ich habe mich biß daher ehrlich vnd redlich verhalten ..." (V, 2:277). Little does the foolish hoodwinked husband comprehend the full import of her promise that "wie ich bißdahero gethan, wil ich ferner thun ..." (V, 2:277). We, however, fully aware of her deceit, are equally perceptive to the irony contained in her statement. Continuing this *double entendre* Meretrix promises to behave as she always has:

Wann ich euch damit kan zugefallen sein, bin ich
auch wol zufrieden, Vnnd wil mich dessen, wie vor
diesem geschehen, teglich befleissigen. (V, 2:277)

This statement elicits the satisfied reply from the unsuspecting Mercator that "Wann du das thust, bin ich wol zufrieden, Die Leute mögen dann auch sagen, was sie wollen" (V, 2:277). In thus convincing her husband of her intent to continue to comport herself in the 'circumspect' manner befitting her married status, Meretrix has, at one and the same time, given herself the opportunity of openly announcing to her husband that she intends to continue to behave in a 'leichtfertig' fashion. Her adulterous intention having thus been cleverly cloaked in the form of a statement intended to provide comfort and reassurance to the husband, Meretrix feels free to continue her scandalous behaviour, now, in a sense, with the blessing of a naïve husband who has never perceived her as being anything but virtuous.

Mercator's pleasure at having found his wife to be 'richtig' puts aside his suspicion that the rumours of her infidelity might indeed be true. So convinced is he now of her innocence that he promises to defend her honour and reputation against anyone who dares to attempt to besmirch it:

... Den Namen mus sie gleichwol nun haben, Vnd ich
mus jhrenthalben vnschuldigerweise den spott auch
dauon tragen. ... Vnd wird mir einer viel dauon
sagen, wil ich jhm so tractiren, ein ander sol
daran gedencken. (V, 3:278)

Even though Meretrix has thus succeeded in persuading her husband of her virtue, it soon becomes obvious that Mercator is finding it increasingly difficult to quell his own suspicions, for having had his suspicions regarding her supposed faithlessness aroused, he continues to brood on the matter. As a result he decides to seek out the instigator

of the rumours and sets out for the city, accompanied once more by Meretrix' good wishes and ironic promise that "... wie ich allzeit gethan, wil ich mich auch ferner verhalten" (IV, 3:281).

In her exchange with Iohan Bouset, who has indicated to her his having witnessed Meretrix and her lover in their adulterous relationship, Meretrix reveals an unfortunate 'blind spot' of her own, for in feeling that she has succeeded in convincing the servant of his error, she little realizes that she has not altered Iohan's perception:

Das Narren Rede hat mich schier erschreckt, ...
Ich hoffe ja nimmermehr, das ers wird gesehen
haben, Das ich meinen Man so listig betrogen
habe. Ich dencke aber, Ich habe es jhme nun so
aus dem sinn wieder geredt, das er nicht wissen
wird, Was er vor eine gelegenheit darumb
habe. (IV, 5:282)

Meretrix is portrayed as being 'erschreckt' over the servant's allusions regarding her deceitful behaviour. It is difficult to assess at this point in the play whether Meretrix is proud of her cunning, whether, to a certain extent, she sits in judgment of herself in that she considers her own actions to be 'listig', or whether she is to be regarded merely as the foil for Heinrich Julius' own negative feelings towards such 'cunning' women.

In any event, feeling that she has convinced the servant of her virtue, Meretrix goes on to assure her lover that she has also convinced her husband of her innocence: "... ich habe es meinem Manne alles aus dem sinne geredet, Er meinet nun nicht anderst, Es sein alle sachen richtig" (IV, 6:283). However, as we know only too well, Iohan Bouset

has remained unconvinced despite his mistress' importunities. Furthermore the husband, although wishing to believe in his wife's innocence, remains unable to quell all of his suspicions. Although both husband and wife are guilty of self-deception, it would appear, as Thomas Mercator praises his wife to his neighbour, that Meretrix has succeeded admirably in her deceit: "Ich dancke vnserm HErrn Gott für das frommes vnd ehrliches Weib, Ich wil keine bessere begeren" (IV, 7:284). By this time, however, it has become obvious not only that Mercator is deluding himself but also that he is beginning to overcompensate for his discomfiture in his manifestation of a determination to avenge the slur upon his wife's reputation. Adrian, at this point, injects a note of caution into the proceedings by suggesting to Mercator that he seek additional information before embarking upon any specific course of retribution. Adrian's advice is based squarely upon the then generally held male point of view: "... So wisset jhr doch selber wol, das der Weiber list kein ende habe, Vnd wenn sie sich solcher Hendel befleißigen wollen, Wissen sie tausent wege wie sie solches verbergen vnd heimlich machen mögen" (IV, 7:285). The message is clear: Mercator must learn to see that women are not to be trusted, especially at those times when they appear to be behaving in a most virtuous and honest manner towards their husbands. Mercator remains skeptical and unconvinced as he continues to insist that, even if the devil denies it, he knows his wife to be honest. However, even as he stoutly defends his wife's innocence, he reveals his own inner uncertainty by the ease with which he is persuaded to discover the truth about his wife by attempting to surprise her a second time. One has the feeling that it is the 'böse lügnhafftige geschrey' regarding his 'frommes vnschüldiges Weib' which

disturbs him more deeply than anything else. Indeed, he is as acutely aware of the 'spott' which these rumours have earned him. As he protests "das ich da niemands finden werde, der nicht da sein sollte" (IV, 7:286), it becomes clear that he will refuse to recognize any telltale evidence of misconduct on Meretrix' part, no matter how blatantly obvious it may be, for a husband so convinced of his wife's honour and virtue will indeed blind himself to the fact that he is in fact being hoodwinked.

Meretrix is not only surprised but is understandably vexed at the second sudden and unexpected return of her husband:

Jesus, lieber Man, Kommet jhr abermal so vnermuthlich wider, Ich gleube vorwar, Ihr habt euch lassen das falsch geschrey so weit einnehmen, Das jhr ein mißtrawen zu mir gesetzt, vnd mir nich mehr gleubet. (V, 1:286)

Upon Mercator's admission of uncertainty about the whole matter, Meretrix challenges him and presses her point home: "Seid doch so argwonig nicht, Vnd gleubet doch losen Leuten nicht so balde, Dann ich bin vn-schuldig, das weis Gott" (V, 1:286). From this it becomes clear that not only is Meretrix free of the pangs of conscience but that she also considers herself to be guiltless in the eyes of God. She continues to press her immediate advantage in informing her husband that if she were as 'leichtfertig' as people accuse her of being, she would have had ample opportunity to hide 'einen Jungen Gesellen' without anyone being the wiser. That she had already performed this feat capably is attested to not only by the response of the husband who naively believes her to be an honest wife, but also by the reaction of Adrian who wondered how Meretrix could have become the object of such rumours: "Ich wohne ja zu negst by jhr, Aber ich habe nichts mercken können" (III, 3:273).

Mercator at this point feels moved to make the promise that "Es sags

vnd sings auch, wer es wolle", he will remain true to her "bis so lang ich dich selber auff offenbarer that finde" (V, 1:287). He will not abandon her and, as a binding token of his sincerity, he gives her a ring. Meretrix, knowing that she can outwit her husband any time she pleases, feels that she has exacted a promise which permits her free rein in continuing her scandalous behaviour in 'all good conscience', as long as she remains undetected in her infidelity by Mercator himself. So sure is she of her ability in the art of deception that she boldly suggests: "Nu wolan, So bin ich auch wol zu frieden, Wann jhr mich offenbar findet, Das ihr mich dann von stundt an vmb's leben bringet" (V, 1:287).

Mercator now more than ever becomes determined not only to avenge his wife's impugned honour, but also by extension, to clear himself of the 'bûs geschrey'. With this in mind he instigates a fight with the barber Gedeon and threatens: "... Ich wil dich noch darzu vor der Obricheit verklagen, Ich wil dich wol lehren, wie du mir vnd meinem armen Weibe die Ehre abschneiden sollest" (V, 4:289). Nothing, apparently, will convince him that his wife is committing adultery and he persists in this view until Amator apprises him of matters strangely reminiscent of and coincidental with events that have recently occurred at his house. He now begins to suspect in earnest that Meretrix may well have deceived him after all:

Das sent mir warlich wunderliche reden, Dann wie
er jtzundt berichtet hat, So ist es mir alles
wieder fahren, Ich solte wol durch meine gütig-
keit vnd einfalt bedrogen werden. (V, 5:290)

Finally he becomes sufficiently aroused to look 'zornig' and reaches the point of accusing his wife of adultery: "ich befinde nun so viel, das es wahr sey, was die Leut von dir gesagt haben" (V, 6:291). Mercator, in repeating rumours which he has heard from Amator, not only provides

Meretrix with the opportunity of playing the indignant and injured wife, but also affords her the opportunity of refuting the rumours about her, for she feels confident enough to counter them with the assertion:

Es wohnet dort vnten ein Kerl, ... der hat ein
 Auge, Vnd hat gar ein glatt Weib Vnd dieselbe
 ist eine arge Huer, Da mag er vielleicht ge-
 wesen sein ... (V, 6:291)

Meretrix reminds Mercator of his promise to disbelieve all rumours unless he finds her 'auff offenbarer that' (V, 6:291-292), showing him the ring which he gave her as bond of his oath. Mercator, half convinced by her argument, still needs to have yet one more question clarified - the issue relating to his wife's certainty that there may be "noch ein Kerl, so Thomas heisset, vnd ein Aug, hier wohnet?" (V, 6:292). From the hope implied in this query it becomes manifestly clear that Mercator so desperately wants to believe in his wife that he totally fails to see the incongruity of the convergence of events. As proof of the 'truth' of her assertions, Meretrix invites her husband to look for the hole in the ground out of which her lover had supposedly crawled. Somewhat resignedly, it appears, Mercator decides to believe his wife in the hope that "Gott gebe das es also sey" (V, 6:292) and it remains for the servant to inform us that Meretrix 'hefft sy dat Loch au der Erde, da hat Bulvthkommen is lathen tho maken" (V, 7:293).

Mercator, obviously taken in by Meretrix' latest ruse, informs his neighbour "... ich [habe] mein liebes Weib auff rechten Flüssen gefunden. Ich habe, Gott lob, an jhr ein frommes Ehrliches Weib, Vnd begere keine bessere, Gott lasse sie mir nur lange" (V, 9:294). No matter what others may say, he is convinced of his wife's honesty. Furthermore he has made her a promise which he intends to keep and will "die Leuten reden lassen, was sie wollen. Kan ich nicht mehr darumb thun, so mus ichs

Gott beuhelen, vnd es mit gedult vertragen" (V, 9:294). He seems non-plussed that others should have such a low opinion of his wife for he finds her to be 'ehrlich vnd fromb' and, because of her piety and honesty, he is determined that he "will sie auch vor ein Ehrlich Weib vertheidigen ..." (V, 10:295). However, this support is conditional and limited: "biß so lange ich sie vnehrlich in der that befinde, Vnd solt ich auch mein leben daran wagen" (V, 10:295).

In analysing this play, Knight (1948:72) considers that, for once, Heinrich Julius did not pursue his usual didactic bent in writing Von einem Weibe. Indeed Knight feels that the play might almost be construed to be 'anti-moral' in that, superficially, everything appears to end well for all concerned - Meretrix being able to persist undetected by her husband in her indulgence in an extra-marital dalliance. As for the other 'dramatis personae', Amator is portrayed only in an amusing interlude and Mercator is permitted to convince himself that he is married to the most chaste and virtuous of women. Upon closer examination, however, it seems evident that it must only be a matter of time before the truth will out and the scandalous behaviour of Meretrix becomes evident to her now suspicious husband. According to Knight (1948:75), "the wife is no doubt meant to appear very reprehensible, and in that (to my view) she does not so appear ..." Knight surmises that this lack of reprehensibility is undoubtedly due to Heinrich Julius' 'faulty execution'. If, on the one hand, Knight (1948) indicates that Meretrix does not appear to be reprehensible and that Mercator was nothing but a fool who deserved to be cheated, Emmrich (1965:670), on the other hand, concludes that:

... dieser mit Blindheit geschlagene Ehemann, der
als einziger nicht wahrhaben will, was alle Welt

weiß, wirkt in seiner Naivität und Vertrauensseligkeit schon nicht mehr lächerlich, sondern rührend. Die Heuchelei der Frau dagegen, mit der sie ihren Triumph erringt, erregt Abscheu.

He states that although Meretrix was obviously able to convince her husband on this occasion, she was not able completely to dispel the suspicions which the rumours have aroused. In consequence it is "nur noch eine Frage der Zeit, bis ihr ehebrecherisches Treiben entdeckt wird".

It is of interest to note that the issue of adultery was of sufficient concern to Heinrich Julius not only to lead him to deal with it in the dramatic genre but also to prompt him to promulgate three edicts in which the judicial and social consequences resulting from such abuses were stressed. As we shall see in the following chapter, his official edicts were emphasized in his tragedies (Buler vnd Bulerin and Ehebrecherin) in which he also demonstrates the spiritual consequences of transgression.

Chapter 3

THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE TRAGEDIES

This chapter will examine the characterization of the woman as presented in Heinrich Julius' three tragedies: 1) TRAGOEDIA HIBELDEHA. Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin, wie derselben Hurerey vnd Vnzucht, ob sie wol ein zeitlang verborgen gewesen, gleichwol entlich an den Tag kommen, vnd von Gott gewlich gestraffet worden sey; 2) TRAGEDIA HIBALDEHA. Von einer Ehebrecherin, wie die ihren Man drey Mahl betreucht, aber zu letzt ein schrecklich Ende genommen habe; and 3) TRAGOEDIA HIEHADBEL. Von einem Vngeratenen Sohn, welcher vmenschlich vnd vnerhörte Mordthaten begangen, auch endlich neben seinen mit Consorten ein erbaermlich schrecklich vnd gewlich End genommen hat.

1) Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin

In the two tragedies, Von einem Buler vnd Bulerin and Von einer Ehebrecherin, Heinrich Julius considers the problem of the dissolution of a marriage. In neither of the marriages portrayed in the two plays is the legally sanctioned union founded on mutual love and affection but rather upon the opposite, mutual distrust and antagonism.

The plot of Buler vnd Bulerin as published in 1593 is basically very simple. In the prologue we are made aware that the activities of two adulterers have been revealed despite their efforts to cloak their behaviour in secrecy. The male adulterer becomes a murderer and is himself slain; the adulteress then commits suicide in despair over the death of her lover. The prologue as thus set out promises an action-packed and titillating play, an interesting prospect for an audience ex-

pecting entertainment.

Pamphilus, the young French aristocrat of Buler vnd Bulerin, laments that love's sharp arrows have wounded him to the extent that he has become passionately inflamed with love for a beauteous young woman he has noticed in church. Unfortunately he does not know of her identity, but despite this disadvantage he decides that he would be willing to sacrifice even his life in seeking out the favours of the lady. Heinrich Julius thereby cleverly sets the stage for the appearance of the lady. For who can this paragon of beauty be - so ravishingly beautiful that a man would be willing to risk his life in order to attain her favour?

Heinrich Julius manages to arouse our curiosity with considerable adroitness in introducing Dina by showing us Pamphilus' personal dramatic reaction to the unknown 'schon Jungfraw zart' with whom he has fallen in 'love'. Our curiosity thus aroused receives its initial satisfaction as the author presents Dina as she is closeted with her maid Phrigia and in so doing gives us, through the conversation, a glimpse of the character of the 'schon Jungfraw zart' Dina.

The lady in question, the wife of an old alcoholic, Ioseph, is not only bursting to tell her maid a secret but also wishes to obtain Phrigia's views concerning the young man whom both saw in church. It becomes obvious that the husband does not join them in their 'religious devotions' and is thus unaware of any interaction in the church. It is noteworthy that although the husband is a drunkard, he at least is not hypocritical in so far as he openly stays away from church, whereas Dina tends to use the performance of her devotional duties as a cover-up for other interests and activities.

Dina does not stop at drawing others into matters relating to her

secret concerns, but rather feels driven to elicit their advice. In this context Phrigia performs not only as a maid to the young woman but also acts in the capacity of confidante. In this role of confidante Phrigia of necessity must listen to Dina's secrets, secrets to be shared but not to be broadcast. The young Dina is thus fortunately able to confide her secret without first having to obtain an assurance that Phrigia can maintain a promise of secrecy. Dina is lucky in her maid, for Phrigia, in sharp contrast to Iohan, is able to keep Dina's secret: "Ja liebe Fraw, was jhr mir auff vertrauwen berichtet, das gebühret mir, das ich solches verschweige" (I, 2:212).

Phrigia astutely comments that Dina would not have noticed the young man if she had been duly attentive during the sermon or had been attending to her prayers. Dina's spirited young nature comes out in her riposte to the admonition implied in Phrigia's comment:

Das müste schade sein, Worzu sollte ich dann Augen
im Kopffe haben? Ich wil vor mich weg sehen, vnnnd
kan gleichwol zun zeiten vber die halbe schelen,
vnd sehen, was mir behaget. (I, 2:213)

Dina obviously feels that as one listens to the sermon one may legitimately glance around in order to see what or who might delight the eye, the spirit and the flesh securing refreshment, as it were, at one and the same time. As a result of this 'vber die halbe schelen' Dina had been able to determine that she had made a significant impression upon the young man: "Stundt er doch in einem hin, vnd sahe mich an, nicht anderst als hette er mich wollen durch vnd durch sehen" (I, 2:213).

Heinrich Julius emphasises the ephemeral nature of Dina's attention in juxtaposing her expression of hope that her love will be returned against an expression of concern for her physical appearance:

Vielleicht ist sein Hertz gegen mir so gesinnet, Als

meines gegen jhme. Vnd hette ich nur gewist, das ich einen solchen Gast da hette finden sollen, Ich wollte mich ein wenig anderst heraus geputzet, vnd zugerichtet haben. (I, 2:213-214)

Dina is acutely aware that artifice and dress can heighten the impression that one makes.

She is determined to bring her passionate yearning for the young man to the point of realization, so that she is indifferent to Phrigia's expressed concerns about what people might say:

Was wollen die Leute viel sagen? Wer wil mich sehen? Die Mauren im Hause sind dicke gnung, da wil keiner durchsehen. (I, 2:214)

From one view the employer-employee relationship between Dina and Phrigia devolves into a parent-child relationship in so far as Phrigia feels able to call her young mistress to task for failing to observe the admonitions of the sermon delivered at the church service which they have attended, reminding her also of the gossip which would ensue if Dina persisted in attempting to gratify her sexual desires. Thus the essentially lonely young woman, Dina, finds in Phrigia both a confidante and a surrogate mother. Phrigia's active role in the unfolding drama terminates with this act of complicity, in that she advises Dina to ask Iohan to act as the actual intermediary between the would-be lovers. Although Phrigia has thus made herself an accomplice before the fact by apparently condoning Dina's plans, she avoids involvement in the more direct task of performing as an intermediary in the 'commission of the crime'. From this point of the play on, Heinrich Julius shows Dina as acting of her own volition, without the guidance and opinion of her maid.

In order to attain her pressing desires, Dina agrees to ask Iohan Bousset, a household servant, for assistance. After initially questioning him about his possible presence in church, she ends by

showing her exasperation and almost childish frustration by calling him a 'schlimmer Schelm' and by asking "kanstu dich nicht ein wenig vmbsehen?" (I, 3:215).

The plan that the servant could be employed in finding the young man's lodgings must now be replaced by another, since Iohan had chosen to attend to the sermon and had not gazed about the church. Dina's despair at the turn of events is reiterated by Pamphilus, both of them appearing to have given up hope rather easily, for as soon as they have been foiled in the immediate implementation of their intended plan, they have become dispirited:

Dina: Ach Gott, Nun is all mein hoffnung
dahin, Ich weis nun nicht, wie ichs
anschlagen sol, ... (I, 4:216)

Pamphilus: O wie ist meinem Hertzen so wehe vnd
bange, Ich weis nicht, was ich vor angst
thun oder anfangen sol ... All mein hoffnung
is vergebens vnd vmbsonst. (I, 5:216)

Despite the apparent hopelessness of her situation, Dina nevertheless exhibits her practical nature, planning to rise early the following morning in order to visit all of the inns in town in the hope of finding the young man, for a lady embarking upon such a course of action before the following morning would only arouse comment and suspicion. In the meantime Dina considers it appropriate to take additional counsel with the maid.

Whilst Dina seeks the maid's advice on the matter, Pamphilus receives a visitation from Satan. In telling Satyrus of his problem, Pamphilus acquaints us with his feelings and perceptions concerning Dina: she is 'ein solche schöne Frau' that he does not believe "das jhres gleichen in der Welt sey" (I, 7:219). What the lover perceives to be the truth about

the woman is in sharp contrast to what Ioseph, the husband, equally believes to be true about his wife. It is at this point that Heinrich Julius reveals one of the reasons for Dina's eager and brash pursuit of her love: Dina is but sixteen years of age and is tied to an old drunkard of sixty:

... der Frawen Man, ... ist wol Sechtzig Jar alt,
Das Weib aber nur von Sechtzehen Jaren, Derselbe
Kerl seufft sich alle tage voll, Vnd kan sich mit
dem Weibe nicht wol vertragen. (I, 7:220)

If Pamphilus considers Dina to be a 'schöne Frau', Ioseph finds her to be the exact opposite: "Sie ist zu böse ... Dann sie hat ein böß Maul" (I, 1:222). The reasons for Dina's 'böß Maul' are undoubtedly connected with Ioseph's insatiable desire for drink, as Iohan Bouset pointedly remarks to his master:

Ioseph: Ich kan das Sauffen nicht lassen. Wann
ich nicht trincke, so werde ich kranck.

Iohan Bouset: So kan oock aw Fraw dat kifen niet
lathen. (II, 1:222)

Just how far the marital situation has deteriorated (it has undoubtedly never been a very happy one) is clarified by Dina, who refers to her husband as her 'Alter vndlüchtiger Eunuchus', someone she would prefer to be rid of:

Das Vnglück hat mich zu dem Manne geführet, Wolte
Gott, Ich köndte seiner mit ehren quidt werden, Er
ist mir doch nirgents nütze zu. (II, 2:223)

It is noteworthy that even though Ioseph is impotent and constantly drunk, Dina, nevertheless, wishes that she might find an honourable way out of her dilemma. Until such a way is found, however, she continues to vent her ill feeling toward him in insults such as that in which she accuses him of 'standing around catching flies with his open mouth' and in accusing him of using what little money they have for drink. Her

words in this instance do not sound like those of a loving wife out to persuade her husband to mend his way, but rather like those of the wife who has been submitted to this state of affairs for years and who has finally decided to retaliate. When Ioseph begs for a kind word she retorts that "Du heltest dich gegen mir dergestalt nicht, Das ich dir solte viel guter Wort geben" (II, 3:224). Dina becomes even more incensed when the servant returns and she is able to find out from him that her husband has organized yet another drinking session:

... du heilloser versoffener vnflath, kanstu in
meinem Hause nicht fressen du must dir auff den
Keller lassen anrichten. ... Pfui scheme dich,
Du gastriges versoffenes Schwein ... (II, 4:225)

When Ioseph attempts to assert his masterly role by punishing the servant for blurting out the truth, Dina's ire knows no bounds:

Trotz sey dir geboten, das du jhme mit einem
Finger anrdrest. Packe dich, Troll dich, Gehe
zum Galgen. (II, 4:226)

Open warfare has now been declared and is solemnly formalized by Dina's promise:

Aber hörstu, kompstu mir voll wieder zu Hauß,
So sol es dir deinen Bart kosten, Des schwere
ich dir einen Eyd, ... (II, 4:226)

If on the one hand Dina wishes for honourable riddance from her old eunuch, Ioseph, on the other hand, is uncertain as to what to do about Dina. Even though he cannot accuse her of being dishonourable, he continues to find, to his great sorrow, that she has 'ein greßlich böses Maul' as far as he is concerned. As a result, he too wishes that he could find a reason which would allow him to be rid of such a termagant.

It is obvious that neither Dina nor Ioseph wish to continue their association and do so only under duress. Dina appears to spend her days either trying to find her drunken husband or ogling young men in

the church, while her husband spends his time avoiding his wife. Dina finally focusses her attention upon Pamphilus, while Ioseph, lacking either imagination or drive, continues to drown his sorrow in drink.

Heinrich Julius shows Dina to be a very determined young woman who ensures that nothing is left to chance in the pursuit of her happiness and the fulfillment of her sexual desires. Her life with Ioseph consists of rounds of recrimination as both Dina in her role as wife and Ioseph as husband vie with one another in their use of the most outrageous and vicious epithets in referring to one another. If one believes Dina's accusations, then Ioseph appears to be no better than a 'versoffenes Schwein' and 'vnflath', whereas in reality he seems a rather pitiable man who is incapable of relating to his wife. According to Ioseph, Dina is the 'loses Balg' whose 'Rachgier' has bereft him of his beard, thus symbolizing his impotence. Such invective hurled in this manner is, of course, not conducive to the fostering of marital harmony. Dina's drive is centred around her determination to obtain her share of sexual love, whereas Ioseph persists in studiously avoiding his responsibilities as husband and master of the household. As wife, Dina is cast in the light of a very unsympathetic character, a character who consistently finds fault, who abuses her husband verbally and physically, and who is not above using her servant so as to achieve her ends. Despite the disparity in their ages, husband and wife appear equally immature; individuals caught in a disastrous marriage, a marriage which contains the seed of its own dissolution (Emmrich, 1963:212). Werner (1976:206) also concludes that "die Ehe, die auf Liebe und Vertrauen gebaut sein sollte, ist durch Egoismus und gegenseitigen Betrug zerrüttet".

If Dina behaves as a shrew and virago within her marriage relation-

ship, castigating her husband with terms such as 'vnflath', her behaviour and vocabulary towards her lover is naturally completely different. Her vituperation appears to become exhausted in her frustrated exchanges with her husband, only sweetness remaining for her lover:

O guter Freundt ... Vielmehr sollte ich euch danck-
sagen, Das jhr mir ein Plesant zumachen allhier er-
schienen sein, Vnd ewern Namen offenbaret habet. (II, 2:228)

Dina's desire for her lover and her obsession with securing a permanent union with the young man prevents her from assessing the situation realistically. She plunges heedlessly into an adventure in the fond hope that a permanent happy solution will be its outcome. She does not stop to contemplate that the travelling 'Edelman' may be just that - a *bon vivant* versed in the art of amorous intrigue. She is completely taken in by his elegant speech, his physique and his presents. The lover's accomplished performance overwhelms the young and naive woman. Dina confesses to him that she does not experience much happiness with her husband and assures her lover that she could easily find more happiness with him. (*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*). She emphasises that Pamphilus is everything that her husband is not. Whereas the former has a 'schöne gestalt', a 'schöne Rede' and a 'holdselige Wort', the latter is characterized as a 'versoffenes Schwein' and as an impotent eunuch. It is little wonder that Dina has fallen in love with Pamphilus, but passion alone does not explain all of the complexities attendant upon her attachment, for, in addition, she views the liaison with Pamphilus as the means by which escape from her unsatisfactory marriage may be obtained - a union with her newly found love ultimately being intended. Unashamedly she expresses her desire for happiness thus:

Vnd [ich] sehe nun nicht liebers, Dann das ewrem
begeren gewilfhret werden, vnd wir vnser leben

bey einander zubringen möchten, Wie ich dann vor
meine Person mich zu ewrem willen hiemit wil
gantzlich ergeben haben. (III, 2:229)

She has made her decision and is ready to surrender herself completely to Pamphilus' will and desires. Pamphilus now becomes the 'hertzallerliebster Schatz' and 'allerliebstes Hertzichen'. Emmrich (1963:231; 1965:667) concludes, however, that Dina also yearns for motherhood, although textual analysis lends little support to this assertion.

Pamphilus presents Dina with some make-up, "auff das jhr ewer Angesicht damit schmincken, vnd mir in meinen Augen vnnd Hertzen desto baß gefallen möchten" (III, 2:230). Dina's delight knows no bounds and as thanks she gives him a 'Schmätzigen'.

Just as the two lovers are happily dancing a galliard, the husband returns to disturb the happy couple. Dina promises to hide her lover in a 'Banckkasten' but at the same time suggests "wir wollen heute so viel thun, als sich leiden wil ..." (III, 2:232). In the event, however, that the lovers cannot achieve as much 'als sich leiden wil', Dina assures Pamphilus that she will send for him as soon as her husband departs for his inevitable morning beer.

The inebriated Ioseph, by questioning the musicians hired by Pamphilus for the occasion, determines that his wife is consorting with a young 'Gesell' in their home. It may be one matter to express one's wish to be relieved of one's wife, but it is quite another to have one's authority openly flaunted by such impropriety; hence the suspicion and questioning. In view of a clearly defined desire on the part of the husband to find a means for ridding himself of his wife, it is surprising that Ioseph is not portrayed as forcefully and manfully entering the house to surprise the supposed adulterers *in flagrante*

delicto, especially in light of the fact that contemporaries of Heinrich Julius viewed adultery as an event impugning the husband's honour. Instead, Ioseph is shown as contenting himself with a meek knock on the door. If he thereby expected to receive a warmhearted greeting from his wife, rather surprising under the circumstance, he is once more disillusioned as Dina immediately upbraids him with "Wo nu? Hastu abermal von der tollén Saw gefressen?" (IV, 1:233). Since proverbially the best method of defense has always been attack, Dina challenges Ioseph's accusation that she has held a revel in front of their house. Under continued questioning, Dina categorically denies having a young 'Geselle' in their house and when Ioseph persists in seeking the truth she sarcastically suggests: "Ey suchet jhn doch. Er sitzt auff der Bühne vn-ter dem Tach, da werdet jhr jhn finden" (IV, 2:234). Although to a large extent Ioseph has only himself to blame for his marital predicament, one cannot help but feel a certain measure of sympathy for him. He never was and never will be a match for his young wife.

If up to this point in the play there remained some doubt as to the successful completion of the alleged adulterous act, we are subsequently informed by the servant that this event has indeed taken place, since the lover went "met vns Frow tot Huis, Ende hefft by sie geschla-pen ..." (IV, 2:235). Indeed, Ioseph has never looked more foolish, a veritable 'Sott', who actually believed his wife enough to search for the young man in the very place suggested by her! In order to be in possession of such intimate details with respect to the adultery, it is manifestly clear that the servant has been given to eavesdropping and to spying on his employers. Furthermore, after having been accused by Dina of being a fool, it is Iohan who flatly calls his mistress a whore.

Nevertheless Iohan is in perfect control of the situation as he systematically makes his mistress aware of the fact that he has witnessed everything. In consequence of these revelations Dina finds herself placed in the invidious position of having to plead for the servant's silence. In order to ensure that he will lie for her if necessary, she pays him 'zehen Taler' and thus having secured his complicity, Dina asserts herself as an employer once more and requests that Iohan act as messenger between herself and the 'Edelman' in order to assure Pamphilus' presence that evening.

If Ioseph looked foolish as a result of his vain search for the young man, Pamphilus has clearly escaped unharmed from the 'Banckkasten', albeit with some fright, although it is worth noting that the young aristocrat seems to be well acquainted with such maneuvers, customary escapades as they are for him in his pursuit of 'Liebe':

... Was muß mann vmb der Liebe willen gleichwol
viel leiden, Ich bin mannichmal so am orthe ge-
wesen, Aber nie so verschlächter worden. (IV, 4:238)

- a telling admission, which leads one to surmise that Pamphilus has no intention of sharing Dina's romantic wish for a life together, for after all, he is an aristocrat and she but a willing and naive girl. Furthermore, although he appears to appreciate the cunning which Dina exhibited by hiding him and misdirecting her husband, one may assume that this event constituted nothing but another amusing interlude in his travels. Since Pamphilus confesses that he could not have thought of an immediate means of escape, while admitting that he is practised in this kind of amorous intrigue, one reaches the inevitable conclusion that not only does he seem to learn little from his escapades, but also, in each case, seems to have depended entirely upon the woman to ensure his escape from

any predicament. Having recovered rather easily from his initial fright, he agrees to visit Dina once more, provided that she assure "das nur all sachen richtig sein, wenn ich komme" (IV, 4:240). Such a condescending and supercilious attitude lends credence to the supposition that Dina is only his plaything.

While Pamphilus plans to revisit his current love, Ioseph numbers himself amongst the most tormented of men - being ashamed of himself not only because he drinks to excess but also because his wife has had 'Geste' in front of their house. Although he considers it appropriate for him to indulge in drunken revelry with his neighbour, he considers it improper for his wife to do likewise in front of their home and feels that Dina, not having been content to abuse him verbally in private, has also abused him physically by keeping her promise:

Als ich meine Frawe des halber zu rede gesetzt,
Hat sie mir nicht allein vnntzte Wort geben, Son-
dern den Bart darzu außgeraufft ... (IV, 5:240-241)

What further proof does Ioseph require that his wife is 'b88p', for surely any woman who dares to emasculate a man by tearing out his beard must indeed be depraved! Ruefully Ioseph concludes that his wife's behaviour toward him clearly demonstrates the validity of all of the old sayings:

Es sey kein weh so gros als hertzeleid, Es sey
kein List vber Frawen List, Es sey kein Rachgier,
vber der Frawen Rachgier. Es sey kein Kopff so
listig, als der Schlangen Kopff. Vnd kein Zahn
so bitter als der Frawen Zahn. (IV, 6:241)

Ioseph concedes that even though Dina is indeed beautiful, she remains such a bad wife that he would prefer to sleep with 'Lewen vnd Drachen' than with such a virago. Even though Ioseph may drink to excess, his inebriation does not render him incapable of realizing and understanding the import of the recent happening at his house. In consequence of

his awareness, Ioseph reaches his decision: he will not return to his wife although such a resolution to part from a spouse represents a major decision. The author characterizes Ioseph's frame of mind in the laments, which are a mixture of self-pity and regret, laments which he pours out to his neighbour Nicodemus. For Ioseph it would have been preferable that Dina had died; however, instead of dying, the 'loses Balg' tore out his beard!

Nicodemus acts as the Duke's interlocutor with respect to the latter's views about the appropriate behaviour of a husband toward his wife. Nicodemus' astonishment over Ioseph's laxity toward his wife is expressed in the following interchange:

Ioseph: Was sol ich machen? Ich habe jhr (leider)
im anfang den Zügel zu lang gelassen, Hette
ichs nicht gethan, es were wol besser vmb
meine sache.

Nicodemus: Fürwar ich habe auch ein Weib, die mus aber
thun was ich haben wil, Vnd wo sie sich vnter-
stünde mir das geringste Wort zu wiederreden,
Ich wolte sie dermassen tractiren, Sie wolte
ein zeitlang daran gedencken. (IV, 7:244-245)

In this short passage Heinrich Julius sketches in condensed form the husband's role in a 'successful' marriage. From the husband's standpoint, such success would appear to depend solely upon an initial and continuing exercise of the husband's authority over his wife, combined with a refusal to allow her much freedom of action. If such action is embarked upon immediately, a measure of marital stability and respect for his person may be expected by the husband. If, however, despite such measures, the wife attempts to gain more freedom than is permitted by her husband, the latter should feel free to take the liberty of punishing her in a manner that she will long remember.

Such a view is in keeping with contemporary viewpoints as is explained by Koebner (1911:162), who concludes that the husband has the "Prügelrecht; er darf, um der Frau seinen Willen aufzuzwingen, jedes Gewaltmittel anwenden ... Stockschläge und Rutenstreiche, auch Hausarrest gelten dabei als völlig legitime Mittel". Such a right, however, is limited only by the fact that the husband is bound to his wife for life and that, furthermore, he may not permanently injure her or endanger her life.

Emmrich (1965:667) believes that Dina, like most women of her time was the victim of economic suppression, a condition which in turn led to legal inequity in marriage and ultimately to psychological suppression. A typical reaction to subjugation under such a repressive arrangement is, ultimately, rebellion against the husband, a situation in which she is clearly portrayed. To a certain extent this view of suppression may indeed be a valid one, for the brief speech by Nicodemus portrays the complete dependence of the woman upon her husband. However, such a view cannot be supported in Dina's case, for from the analysis it is clear, and Ioseph confirms this, that Dina has enjoyed a great measure of freedom in her marriage and that Ioseph, much to his ultimate regret, has held the reins of marriage rather loosely. Economic repression alone cannot be construed as the sole reason for Dina's 'rebellion', the prime contributing factors to Dina's 'abnormal' behaviour surely being Ioseph's impotence and excessive predisposition towards drinking. To this must be added Dina's own youth and inexperience. The dream and the reality are completely separated in Dina's and Ioseph's marriage, as among other things sexual gratification is denied her. At sixteen years of age a woman is not necessarily equipped mentally nor content

physically to be tied to a much older and allegedly impotent man, nor can she be regarded as being equipped to handle with equanimity the difficult marital situation engendered as a result of the husband's drunken habits. It is not surprising therefore that the author portrays Dina's angry tirades against her drunken spouse with considerable vigour.

As Ioseph continues to bemoan his wife's refractory behaviour, Nicodemus appears amazed that Dina should be capable of an illicit affair: "Das kan ich nicht wol gleuben, Das ewre Fraw so leichtfertig sein sollte, Man hat auch ja bißdahero nichts böses von jhr gehört" (IV, 7:246). Thus it would appear that 'leichtfertiges' behaviour is regarded as being tantamount to culpability. Nicodemus proposes that a scheme better designed to catch the adulterers than that already employed by Ioseph, the 'Fantast', would be to hide in the house and to apprehend the lovers *in flagrante delicto*. Ioseph, however, adamantly refuses to return home in order to carry out such a scheme:

... Ich wil Haus vnd Hoff stehen lassen, vnd mich
in eine Herberge legen, Vnd vmb mein Geld zehren.
Ins Haus will ich nicht wieder kommen. (IV, 7:247)

This approach is negated only by his desire to remove all of his money. Nicodemus' flat statement that Ioseph has now provided Dina with greater opportunity 'zubuhlen' than before, is in turn underscored by the servant, Iohan, who comments: "he lett sein Frouw in de Huis, Ende als sy thouoern nien Hur gewest ... So sou sie nu wel ein werden" (V, 1:247). The implication appears to be that the husband not only determines whether his wife turns into a whore or not but also in fact contributes towards his wife's unacceptable behaviour by his adamant refusal to take appropriate corrective action.

The coast has now been cleared - the sole remaining obstacle to the fulfillment of Dina's desire, Ioseph, having voluntarily abandoned his position by departing with the remainder of his money. It is evident that Dina is a young woman who is accustomed to having her own way and, as her lover has failed to come when bidden to do so, she takes pains to have the servant communicate her displeasure to him. Pamphilus' assurances to Iohan that he would rather surrender his own life than leave Dina prove to be prophetic, for little does Pamphilus suspect that he will indeed give his life for the lady, although at this point the statement has a hollow ring as he adds that other pressing business had prevented him from coming.

As the second tryst proceeds (the lovers 'hertzen sich mit einander ... brauchen gesticulationes gegen einander. Entlich tantzen sie zusammen' (V, 5:251)) the night watchmen approach to break up the merri-ment. Pamphilus' disdainful replies provoke an altercation in which he slays one of the watchmen and is himself mortally wounded by the others.

Dina yearns for love and a happy marriage in order to bring meaning to her otherwise featureless existence, but just as Dina thinks that her hopes are about to be realized, her husband having moved out, and Pamphilus having 'moved in', as it were, she is transformed by the author into a 'tragic' character, for the object of her concentrated affection, love and hope is suddenly and cruelly taken from her side.

Dina's initial reaction to the news of Pamphilus' death is disbelief, a reaction which quickly changes to distress as she determines the veracity of the news. A catastrophe has occurred without her being able to prevent it. Knight (1948:36) finds that "in Buler vnd Bulerin ... the catastrophe is forced, or rather, is tacked on to the end without

being in any real sense motivated by what has gone before ..." only to contradict himself a few pages later (43) in asserting that "tragic, in the highest sense, it [the play] is not, although for once the catastrophe is natural and even rather pathetic." Indeed, Dina's subsequent lengthy monologue would appear to be a melange of moralizing diatribe and genuine pathos. Her heartfelt grief over the loss of her lover finds expression in: "O mein lieber Pamphile, O lieber Pamphile, Du mein einiger trost auff Erden, mus ich dich dergestalt verlieren" (V, 8: 256-257). The sudden reversal of her fortunes have shattered her hope for a life with Pamphilus. It is clear that Dina's only vision had been that of an untroubled future to be lived in loving harmony with Pamphilus. Her remorse is so great that she considers herself to be guilty of her lover's death, for by her birth she has contributed to his death. What can be considered to be genuine pathos is abruptly followed by a litany of self-accusations. Instead of devoting the remainder of her unhappy life to reflection upon God, she permitted 'die stinckende schandlose Hoffart' to possess her to the extent that she did not observe 'Gott den Herrn'. Not only had worldly thoughts been her chief concern in life, but she had also been discontent with her God-given appearance: "Schmückung meines stinckenden Madensacks, vnnd auffbindung meiner Teuffels Lareuen ..." (V, 8:257) having been more important to her than the 'Predigten Götliche Wort'. Religious attendance had not been for the sake of listening to edifying sermons but rather "Ob ich durch meine gemachte schöne Hurische vnd vnzüchtige Geberde jemand's ein Auge auff mich zuwerffen, bewegen köndte" (V, 8:257). She attributes the sole reasons for Pamphilus' becoming an adulterer and murderer to her stinking vanity, the alteration of her natural beauty by means of

make-up, her whorish wanton manner and her deceitful and cunning words.

Because she now considers herself to be the cause of shedding Pamphilus' innocent blood, Dina feels that God and mankind have forsaken her. However, had she fulfilled certain conditions such as placing her trust in God, being devoted to God's word, being faithful and obedient to her husband and refusing to use make-up she would neither be in her present state, nor would she be responsible for the death of Pamphilus and the night watchman. The consequence of her failure to fulfill these obligations has been to incur God's wrath and to awaken her conscience. She finds her sins oppressive: "es drücken mich auch die Sünden, dazu ich durch mein verursachen dich Meinen allerliebsten Pamphilum Gebracht habe" and concludes that "... Meine Sünde sind grösser, als das sie mir können vergeben werden. Gott kan vnd wil mir nicht gnedig sein" (V, 8:258). In vain does she appeal for a natural cataclysm to terminate her unbearable agony. She feels that she has no choice other than to commit suicide, for if she is to be denied happiness and a life with Pamphilus in the 'real' world, she resolutely assures herself of the right to a 'life' with Pamphilus in hell. Dina's suicide is not 'unmotivated' or 'tacked on' as Knight would have us believe, but rather it follows logically from her shattered hopes for a life 'of this world' to be shared with Pamphilus. That hope having been denied her, coupled with her unwillingness to resume her featureless life with her drunken husband, she has no alternative except suicide. For surely in suicide hope might present itself again. The hopes 'of this world' become hopes that might perhaps be fulfilled in another 'world of the spirit'. In this apparently despairing act of suicide she in fact revives and carries her hopes, aspirations and romantic idealism

with her into death.

It is clear that Heinrich Julius views Dina's sins to be of such magnitude that they must be punished by death and damnation. Just as Satyrus promises those still living that "so noch lauffen, vnd jhre Männer betriegen, Vnd jhre Hurerey so heimlich machen, Wil ich auch, so baldt sie reiff sein, abbrechen" (V, 8:259)

2) Von einer Ehebrecherin

If in Buler vnd Bulerin the theme of the cuckold received secondary treatment, it becomes the major concern of the 'tragedy' of Von einer Ehebrecherin, published in 1594.

Although Heinrich Julius does not formally apprise us of the upcoming action by way of a prologue as he did in Buler vnd Bulerin, it may be considered that Gallichoraea's opening gloomy monologue performs an equivalent function. Like the unhappy Ioseph, Gallichoraea feels miserable despite his essentially good health and considerable wealth. Life's pleasures are there to be enjoyed but his wife prevents him from tasting such pleasures. Despite this, the author uses the play mainly to expound the viewpoint, expressed through the husband, that it is the wife's duty and responsibility to ensure her husband's happiness:

... Denn von dem ich billig solte Frewde, Trost,
Ruhmb, Vnd Ehre haben, Mus ich (leider Gott erbarme
es), Traurigkeit, Beklummernis des Hertzens, Schande,
vnd Spott gewertig sein. (I, 1:403)

However, not only should the wife provide happiness and comfort, but she should also ensure that her husband's fame and honour remain unsullied. That this is apparently not the case for Gallichoraea becomes evident as he lets it be known that he considers himself to be the sad object of derision. A wife's beauty and reasonableness alone cannot, it

seems, be regarded as guarantees, ensuring a happy marriage. Gallichoraea formulates his problem thus: his wife, although 'außbündig schön' and 'Verständig gnung', has managed to arouse such suspicion in him, "das ich jhr bald nicht weiter glaube, Denn als ich sie sehe ..." (I, 1:403). The 'allerhandt vnrichte, vnd verdecktige hendel' in which he perceives his wife to be involved prevent him from believing in her honesty. Not only does Gallichoraea's suspicion lead him to feel that his wife is dishonest, but he also endows her with exceeding cunning, a feeling based upon the fact that his previous attempts to get 'hinter den Wind' have all been in vain. However, Gallichoraea requires hard facts not only in order to enable him to verify his grave doubts about his wife but also that he may finally have the basis for legal action against her. In consequence, he proposes to embark upon an ingenious scheme for obtaining such indisputable proof:

... ich wil mich befeleissigen, ob ich vnermerckt
 könnte an einen gerathen, Der mich vnd mein Fraw
 nicht kennet, vnd wil dem so viel anleitung geben
 Das er sich in mein Haus verfüge ... (I, 1:403)

So bent is he upon finding his wife 'auffn fahlen Pferde' that Gallichoraea concocts the perverted plan of securing an agent to provide evidence of his wife's infidelity.

That Gallichoraea is both tormented mentally by his suspicions as well as frustrated by his inability to confirm them in the apprehension of his wife is shown in the following wistful interchange with his servant, Iohan Bouset:

Gallichoraea: Wann sie mich nur Lieb hette.

Iohan Bouset: Wel sol sie aw niet lieff hebben,
 schlap sie doch alle nacht bey aw.

Gallichoraea: Wenn sie nur bey mir alleine bliebe.
 (I, 2:404)

It is obvious that the wife is dissatisfied with just 'schlafen' with her husband, since Gallichoraea feels that she dispenses her 'Liebe' to others during the day. It is little wonder that Gallichoraea's frame of mind leaves him with a feeling of despair coupled with a deeply felt desire to find out the truth: "Ich wolte nicht mehr, Dann das ichs so gewisse von jhr wüste, als ichs nicht weis ..." (I, 2:405). A humble wish but nevertheless a wish fraught with danger. The foolish husband becomes so rash in his behaviour that he even attempts to gain his servant's assistance in trapping his wife:

... Wann ich dich schon bey jhr finde, Ich wil dir
nichts thun, Lege dich nur zu jhr, Vnd woh du es
thust, Vnd ich dich bey jhr finde, wil ich dir noch
ein verehrung darzu geben. (I, 2:405)

Iohan unabashedly enquires whether Gallichoraea's intention is to turn his wife into a whore, to which the husband retorts that as far as he suspects, she has already behaved as one. The servant then wisely declines the offer on the religious grounds, "Dat nien Ehbrekr sou in dat Himel kamen" (I, 2:406) and because it is preferable to be a cuckold who at least stands a chance of entering heaven. However, in order to obtain 'truth' and 'peace of mind', Gallichoraea is willing to risk everything.

Gallichoraea, who finds life at home becoming so unbearable that he prefers the market place, "... Dann wan ich im Hause bin, sehe ich nichts anderst, dann das sich nur mein Hertz bekummert" (II, 2:407), encounters a young indigent student, Pamphilus. Despite his ragged clothes, Pamphilus appears to Gallichoraea to represent the ideal instrument for carrying out his plan:

Ey du bist ein feiner junger gerader wolgewachsener
Kerl, Vnd sihest mich dafür an, Das du ohn allen

Zweiffel wol soltest angenehm sein beym Frawen
zimmer. (II, 2:408)

The implication here seems to be that since women are especially fond of young men with flawless physiques, Gallichoraea's wife would be unable to resist the advances of the young man. Gallichoraea duly advertises his wife to Pamphilus as 'außbündig schön' and moreover as "gar freundlich, vnd mag gern mit Jungen gesellen reden ..." (II, 2:408-409). In order further to ensure that his snare is properly set, Gallichoraea provides Pamphilus with funds for new clothes. In response to Pamphilus' expression of legitimate concern about the possibility of danger, Gallichoraea replies reassuringly that "Die fraw ist wol so listig, die wird dir wol ferner anschlege geben ..." (II, 2:409). Pamphilus, for his part, is so confident of his prowess with the 'Pandor' that he is sure the wife will meet him, because if the wife is "guter haar, so wird sie es nicht versitzen, Sie kompt entweder ans Fenster, Oder an die Thur, Dann das sein die rechten Lockuogel auff sölche Leute ..." (II, 2:409). It is agreed that Pamphilus subsequently will not only render a detailed account of his adventure but he will also refrain from admitting to anyone that he received advice, the initial suggestion, and financial support for the escapade from the husband himself.

Gallichoraea's gloom changes to jubilation at the prospect that the 'heat' is now on and that no matter what else may happen, he will finally trap his wife! Iohan comments *a propos* his master's glee: "Ia vorwar ghy hebt gar wol bestellet, Als aw Fraw vorher sou from gewesen syn, Sal sy nu ein Hur werden" (II, 3:410). No matter how cunning the wife may be, the husband considers himself capable of outsmarting her. However, Iohan's comments prove to be prophetic: "et sal niet geschien, ghy werdet aw süllest bedrogen finden" (II, 3:410). Gallichoraea's reaction

to the latter suggestion is to propose an additional plan, based essentially upon telling his wife that he has to leave on a trip, when in actual fact he intends to return unexpectedly and surprise her. Iohan, however, remains so convinced that the wife will outsmart the husband, that he agrees to the husband's suggestion of a wager. Gallichoraea then sends Iohan to fetch his wife in order that he might tell her of his intended 'trip'.

It is worth noting that up to this point in the action, the wife, who according to the title of the play is the heroine, has not appeared, whereas in Buler vnd Bulerin Dina is present from the second scene of the beginning act. When Scortum, Gallichoraea's wife, finally does appear, she reacts reasonably and sensibly to her husband's revelation. If one were to judge her on the basis of her replies to her husband, one would not suspect her of having any intentions of betraying him. Indeed, on the face of it, her replies are as solicitous as those expressed by Meretrix in Von einem Weibe. She reminds him that due to the lateness of the day he could not possibly return home in time and suggests: "... Bleibet doch hie bis morgen, Dann bey nacht ist nicht gut reisen, Ihr möchtet zu schaden kommen" (II, 4:412). When Gallichoraea appears to remain adamant, Scortum replies in leaving: "... Der liebe Gott behüte Euch vor allem vbel" (II, 4:412). At this point it is difficult to assess whether this reflects genuine concern for her husband's safety or is simply hypocrisy.

Gallichoraea seems to be unconcerned that his wife might be regarded as a whore as a result of his stratagem. His prime motivation is now exposure and retribution: "... es wird meiner Frawen aber vbel bekommen, Wann ich komme vnd sie so find" (II, 4:413). Since he still has 'Augen

im Kopffe das ich sehen kan ..." Gallichoraea remains convinced that he will be able to get to the bottom of this matter. Iohan disagrees by stating that he perceives his master to be an utter fool in thrusting temptation into his wife's arms in the form of a handsome young man.

Scortum's initial speculation over her husband's sudden desire to take a trip is immediately followed by a correct assessment of the situation:

Ich glaube vorwar er habe es auff versuchen gethan,
Das er irgent meint, ... wann vielleicht meiner
Bulen einer zu mir keme, Das er mich vberraschen
vnd also zu schanden machen wolle ... (II, 4:414)

Scortum thus admits to her suspected adulterous behaviour. Unlike Meretrix she has not just one 'Bule', but rather several lovers sharing her favours. Not content with the lovers she already has, she continues to cast her eye about for another 'hüpsch Jung gesell' who would help her pass the time agreeably and who might also assist her in ruining her husband's scheme to trap her. If the husband is foolish enough to think he can catch her, she will ensure that his plan is thoroughly 'verkeglet'.

Initially, upon hearing Scortum's solicitous request to her husband to refrain from travelling abroad at night and reminding him of possible dangers of such a venture, one might be led to speculate that Gallichoraea's perception of his wife's character may have been unfounded and may border on the paranoid. Expressions of wifely concern such as those displayed by Scortum could surely be interpreted as signifying genuine concern and care for the welfare of the spouse. However, such an assumption is immediately shattered with Heinrich Julius' juxtaposition of Scortum's statement of her true sentiments, a statement which clearly demonstrates her culpability and deceit. As we now know with certainty, the husband has had every reason to suspect his errant wife.

Pamphilus, freshly attired in clothes befitting a young aristocrat, now serenades Scortum. During the course of this interlude, he indicates that he does not like his inn because it contains such 'wunderlich gesindlein' and he proposes that the wife provide lodgings for him. Scortum's delight with the request leads her to suggest that since the house is small:

... So wil ich euch in meine Kammer betten,
Dann mein Man ist doch nicht zu Hauß, Vnd
seine stette sol für euch bereit sein. (II, 7:415)

She reassures Pamphilus that while it is unlikely her husband will return, she still intends to arrange matters in such a way that he will never know that a young man has been in his house. While providing such assurances, she leads the lover into the house suggesting: "Ich wil euch die gelegenheit im Hause weisen, Wie wirs machen wollen" (II, 7:415).

The 'smart' husband of the Ehebrecherin, Gallichoraea, returns from his 'trip' as planned, knocks on the door, and calls his wife to open just as Ioseph does in Buler vnd Bulerin. In this matter both cuckolds lack the astuteness displayed by Mercator in Von einem Weibe. This knocking allows Scortum sufficient time to employ her delaying tactics. Pretending not to recognize the man as her husband, she refuses to open the door to him. Only after the servant's intervention does Scortum relent, admits recognition of her husband, and consents to open the door. Scortum's pretense provides Iohan with an opportunity to remark facetiously that he considers his master's wife honest: "Dann se wilt genen fromden Man inlaten" (II, 8:416). The successful stratagem of pretending to be unable to recognize her husband provides Scortum with the time needed to hide the lover. She now feigns modesty and innocence:

... Dann ich weis wol, das mir nicht gebühret, wann
jhr nicht zu Haus seid, Das ich solte frembde Leute

vnnd sonderlich bey Nachte, einlassen ... (II, 9:417)

It is clear that she only pretends to adhere to society's strict moral rules when, in actual fact, she uses them as a cloak for the pursuit of her own ends. Escaping as the couple enter the house, Pamphilus informs us that not only did the wife ask him to return the following evening, but in gratitude for his sleeping with her she has also presented him with 'dis Himbt vnnd Krage vnnd diß Gelt ...' This admission causes Emmrich (1965:670) to conclude quite rightly that Scortum's relationship with her lover is dominated by naked interest and "gefühlloser barer Zahlung". This viewpoint is subsequently reiterated by Werner (1976:103), who comments that "die sexuelle Gier ... ohne Beschönigung unverhüllt dargestellt ist". Pamphilus is amply rewarded for his amorous efforts - not only does he enjoy the gratification and pleasure of the 'dalliance', but he also obtains much needed money and suits of clothing. Being a willing and obliging 'student' turns out to be a profitable undertaking.

While the lover seeks rest after his 'labours', the husband is denied such comfort. The reason for the latter's lack of sleep is related by the servant, who divulges the truth when the neighbour Adrian enquires as to the reason for the previous night's disturbances: "Et was ein ander Man by die Frow int Huis, Vnd darum wolt sie so bald niet vp maken, Vnd jhr Man in laten" (III, 2:419). Hoping that the neighbour will ignore the servant's remarks, Gallichoraea eagerly waits for the arrival of Pamphilus, who finally appears and relates his adventures in great detail - indicating exactly where he was hidden and revealing the agreed upon formula used by the wife in order to signal to the lover that the coast was clear. Pamphilus reveals that because Scortum has promised him a 'statliche Verehrung' he has agreed to return for the second time.

The second encounter proceeds as the first, and as on the previous night, Gallichoraea knocks on the door to gain admittance. Once more Scortum pretends not to recognize her husband and only after Iohan's confirmation of his identity does she let him in. After the husband has vainly searched the premises for the lover, Scortum confronts him with "... was machet jhr hie? Ich gleube vorwar, Ihr meinet, Ich habe einen Bulen im Hause" (IV, 2:426). Since the husband agrees with her perception, she assures him not only of her honesty but also that if she were really guilty as he seems to think, she would make it 'so bundt vor die Augen' that he would never notice anything. As she proceeds to demonstrate what she would do, Pamphilus, of course, seizes the opportunity to escape and remarks, while leaving, that had it not been for the wife's cunning, he would not have known what to do. If the husbands in the two tragedies appear to be dolts, the lovers can lay little claim to greater wisdom.

Gallichoraea's problem has intensified. Although he is now certain of his wife's guilt, he is unable to proceed as planned, since he has been totally unable to surprise her *in flagrante delicto*.

Jetztundt bin ich zehen mal erger daran, als ich vor
diesem, Dann vorhin stund ich halb im zweiffel. Nun
aber weis ich gewisse, das sie eine Hure ist ... (V, 2:429)

Gallichoraea is truly confronted with a dilemma: If he should accuse Scortum of adultery, he has no way of substantiating his accusation because it has now become likely that both she and the young man would deny it. Furthermore, if it should be found out that he, the husband, has instigated the affair, he would become the laughing stock of the village. Gallichoraea refuses to recognize that he may have contributed significantly to Scortum's adulterous behaviour, for in order to justify his

behaviour he reasons that he had sent the young man to his wife only to bring 'jhre Bulerey an den tag'. Iohan's attempts to make his master understand that his wife is even more cunning a maneuverer than he will ever be are in vain and it takes Pamphilus' account to make him finally realize that "Inn dem ich andere vermeine zubetrieden, betriege ich mich selber" (V, 3:431). Not content with this, however, he now proposes to obtain incontrovertible proof by way of a third tryst between his wife and her lover.

Definite proof of his intentions to burn down his own house and murder the lovers is to be found in his violent exclamation: "Ich wil Huren vnd Bußen zusammen im Hause verbrennen" (VI, 1:432). Demands for the delivery of the lover are accompanied by threats that he will "das Haus oben dem Kopffe anstecken" (VI, 1:433). In between denials with respect to harboring a 'Bule' in the house and admonitions regarding the husband's foolishness in wanting to burn down the house, Scortum requests that he should at least help her remove a barrel of dirty laundry from the house so that she may have something to wear after it has burned down.

Having been prevented by Adrian from carrying out his resolution to burn down the house and having been unable to find the lover, Gallichoraea admits "nung habe ich vbel erger gemacht, Habens die Leute vorhin nicht gewist, so werden sie es nun erst erfahren" (VI, 4:435). His initial sorrow at being unable to entrap his wife then takes on an aura of helplessness: "Warumb machstu mich armen Mann so betriegen ..." (VI, 5:436). Scortum solemnly assures him of her innocence and underscores her assurance by stating, "Vnd wo ichs gethan habe, so straffe mich Gott, Vnd ich habe weder hier noch in jennem Leben einige frewde" (VI, 5:436).

Her conscience clearly does not trouble her at this point, for she smugly reiterates her facility in conducting her amorous liaisons secretly:

"Dann darauff habe ich ausgelernet solche dinge heimlich, das es niemand mercket, auß zuführen" (VI, 5:436).

Since Gallichoraea departs in a 'traurig' and 'zorniches' frame of mind, it is not surprising that, upon hearing from Pamphilus that he had been cuckolded for a third time, he exclaims: "O ich vnglückseliger Mensch, O das ich nie geboren were, Ach das ich nur Todt were ..." (VI, 6:437). His attempts to 'trip up' his wife have earned him nothing but ridicule. Iohan continues to delight in exposing his master's problems by informing Adrian of recent events (VI, 7:438-440). Gallichoraea's attempts to bear this cross stoically result in insanity in consequence of which Adrian and Iohan feel compelled to cage him so that he will not hurt himself.

With the sudden onset of Gallichoraea's insanity, Scortum finally and surprisingly discovers that her many sins weigh heavily upon her and in a monologue very reminiscent of Dina's, Scortum confesses her sins. Through the 'gnawing worm' of her conscience, Scortum comprehends the full import and consequences of her actions, although her sole concern in her life, up to this point, had been to hide her 'Hurerey' from world and husband. In a manner reminiscent of Dina's view of herself as the cause of Pamphilus' death, Scortum exclaims: "Das mein Man seiner Sinne beraubet vnd toll worden ist, hat niemands anderst denn ich allein durch meine Hurerey verursacht: (VI, 11:443). She exclaims that her greatest sin was in committing adultery, in consequence of which God's judgment, "das kein Hurer vnd Ehebrecher sol ins Reich Gottes kommen" (VI, 11:433) has been pronounced upon her. She can now recognize the nature and

gravity of her sins and appreciates that she has acted contrary to the strictures placed upon her by her marital vows and despairs that her sins can ever be forgiven. Her fears and expressed desire to be delivered from 'der grossen Pein' are answered by Satyrus who brings her 'succor' in the form of a rope with which she may end her life. Since there is nothing to which she can fasten the rope, nor any human being willing to help her, she calls upon the devil to alleviate her pain: "So kommen die Teuffel mir zu Hülff vnd zu Trost, Dann den selben habe ich gedinet, Ach das sie doch kemen vnd geben mir meinen Lohn" (VI, 11:443), whereupon the devil obligingly hastens her passage into eternal damnation by tightening the noose.

If, on the one hand, the final act of tragedy in Buler vnd Bulerin results directly from the abrupt dissolution of Dina's dreamworld, that in Von einer Ehebrecherin, on the other hand, appears to be as unmotivated and 'tacked' on to the ending as Knight (1948) suggests, for in order to be consistent with the play as developed to that point, the author should have portrayed Scortum as being jubilant over the fact that her husband's illness would henceforth prevent his interference in her affairs.

In this play Heinrich Julius realistically contrasts the husband's perception concerning his wife's deviousness with the wife's actual practice of her deceit. As wife, Scortum is portrayed in as unflattering a light as was Dina, although in contrast with Dina's situation it is difficult to understand why this wife would wish to betray a husband who is the antithesis of Dina's impotent, inebriated Ioseph. Gallichoraea's melancholy mourning over his wife's unfaithfulness alerts us to the fact that perhaps society's mores may have been flaunted.

Whereas for Dina, 'love' represented more than mere sexual gratification, for Scortum 'love' cannot be interpreted to mean anything other than such gratification. Gallichoraea, who bemoans the fact that his wife sleeps with others, ironically contributes to his wife's sexual gratification by paying a stranger to sleep with her in order that he, Gallichoraea, may assure himself of her infidelity. The wife for her part pays the stranger in order to ensure that he return for additional 'favours'. Heinrich Julius thus clearly shows that 'love' as interpreted by Dina bears no resemblance to Scortum's interpretation of the concept. Whereas Dina seeks to fulfill her sexual desires by intending to enter into a permanent relationship with the lover, Scortum, content in her marital situation, indulges in her sexual activities as a pleasant diversion. On the one hand Dina is deeply involved emotionally with her lover, whereas on the other hand, Scortum is shown as being devoid of any feeling of affection for her partner in her sexual encounters. Both Emmrich (1965:670) and Werner (1976:90) subscribe to such a viewpoint. Neither critic considers Scortum to be anything other than an individual seeking sexual gratification whenever the opportunity presents itself. Such lack of feeling is also amply demonstrated by the lover, who, after having obtained his gratification and his payments, simply departs without farewell and further concern for the woman. Scortum thus used the young man in much the same manner as Pamphilus used Dina.

Dina's sole concern had been her ultimate union with her lover. Scortum's sole concern is for herself - the lover being but one among many for her. If in Buler vnd Bulerin Heinrich Julius shows Dina to be the plaything of the young aristocrat, he reverses the roles in Ehebrecherin by showing Pamphilus, the young indigent student, as being a

transient, albeit willing, diversion for Scortum.

Emmrich (1963:130; 1965:669) feels that Scortum does not hold our interest beyond the point of her involvement in the three 'trysts' engineered by her husband. While providing a motive for Dina's mistreatment of her husband in referring to her youth and to her strong desire for a permanently happy life together with the young 'Edelman', Heinrich Julius provides no such motives for Scortum's behaviour. The lack of any such motivation may then, in fact explain the hypocritically 'decent' mien she displays towards her suspicious husband Gallichoraea. It may be assumed that she is relatively content in her marital situation, since it allows her considerable freedom, a succession of lovers, and the freedom to carry on her love affairs without being apprehended by her husband. This freedom obviates the necessity of mistreating her husband in the overt manner displayed by Dina. Heinrich Julius portrays Scortum's baseness and deviousness with considerable skill. Her husband's comments about his wealth combined with her manifestations of hypocrisy lend credence to the assumption that Gallichoraea is in fact her 'meal ticket'. This being the case, it behooves her to refrain from using verbal and physical abuse, such as that resorted to by Dina, toward her husband.

Whereas in Buler vnd Bulerin the author succeeds in eliciting a certain amount of sympathy both for Dina's predicament in being tied to an old drunkard and also for Ioseph's inability to arouse any compassion in his young headstrong wife, one is left with no such feeling of sympathy toward either Gallichoraea or Scortum. A husband, who deviously sets the trap for his wife in order to demonstrate her suspected unfaithfulness has only himself to blame if she outsmarts him and does not provide

him with the proof he seeks. Despite Emmrich's statement to the contrary, the wife in Ehebrecherin does hold our interest beyond the stage of her involvement in the three 'trysts', for what could be more dramatic or unusual than the manner of her death. However, she cannot elicit our sympathy in that her husband has not overtly provided her with any cause for her intentional deceit, although our knowledge and her discovery of his scheme might elicit such were we not aware of her many love affairs. Having portrayed two essentially pitiable characters in Dina and Ioseph, the author now contrasts this mismatched couple with an equally mismatched but unlovable pair in the husband and wife Gallichoraea and Scortum.

3) Von einem ungeratenen Sohn

Of the eighteen characters listed in the 'Personae Tragoediae', of Von einem ungeratenen Sohn, Heinrich Julius' third tragedy, the two women, Patientia, the wife of the old duke Seuerus, and Pudica, the wife of the duke's eldest son, play only minor roles. Whereas Scortum's actual appearance on stage was very brief, being confined largely to her closing monologue, Patientia and Pudica's roles are even more abbreviated.

As Seuerus feels his end nearing, he wants to ensure that both of his sons are properly provided for after his death. His decision to transfer the reins of government to his elder son, Probus, and to buy off the headstrong younger son, Nero, generates the bloodbath, engineered by the revengeful Nero.

Through Seuerus, Heinrich Julius reiterates the biblical command that children should honour their father and their mother:

... ehret ewern Vater vnd Mutter, Mit der That,
Mit Worten, vnd mit geduldt, Auff das vnser
Segen auff euch kommen möge. (II, 4:345)

The high place of honour accorded to Seuerus' wife is eloquently expressed in the old man's earnest solicitation to his eldest son:

So lange aber gleichwol mein Weib, Dein Fraw
Mutter im leben, Soltu sie jimmer mit zu rathe
ziehen, vnd gebürlich ehren Wie ich sie dann
zu dero behuff zu einer Vormünder wil verordnet
haben. (II, 4:347)

Although the old duke wishes his eldest son to rule the duchy, he stresses the importance of his wife's advice in contributing to its successful government. In this it is clear that Heinrich Julius expresses a very modern viewpoint in that he considers women as being capable of contributing sage advice. The play indicates that not only should the son seek his mother's advice at all times, but he must also maintain her in honour and dignity:

Die Leibzucht vnd vnterhalt, So ich deiner
Fraw Mutter gemacht, Soltu jhr halten, Vnd
vor andern schützen vnd handthaben ... (II, 4:347)

The biblical admonition has been expanded by Heinrich Julius. The dutiful son, Probus, willingly accedes to his father's desires in that he promises to seek not only God's advice but also that of 'meiner Fraw Mutter vnd Ehrlicher Leute Rath'. Furthermore, it appears that his father's exhortation to respect and honour his mother would have been freely forthcoming in any event because the son intends to show "gegen dieselbigen aller schuldigen gebühr ... Wie das E.G. angeordnet, Sich auch ohn das eigenen vnd gebühren wil" (II, 4:347). It is worth noting here that even though Patientia appears but briefly, the implication remains that, as the first lady of the land, her advice is to be sought in matters of state and, in her role of queen mother, the privileged status which was

accorded her as wife of the ruler is to be maintained, with all the attendant honours.

Seuerus' repeated attempts to have his recalcitrant youngest son Nero honour both father and mother, "dann der HERR wil von den Kindern die Eltern geehret haben ..." (II, 5:348), fall on deaf ears. The repeated admonition that "Gott wil die Eltern von den Kindern geehret haben" (IV, 2:359-360) is only finally 'accepted' by Nero because his nefarious plan is predicated on a successful pretense of remorse. Nero's inherently brutal nature becomes manifest in his intent to murder the entire family in order to take over the government himself. His mother has to be eliminated because, according to the assessment made by his abettors in the proposed crimes, she could "sonstet allen handel verderben, die Landtschafft ist jhr wol gewogen, vnd möchte sich zu jhr schlagen ..." (IV, 3:361). Thus the first lady of the land, renowned for the love which the people bear her, is considered by Nero to be a political liability to be eliminated in order that he may attain his goals. Her permanent removal would also present a double 'benefit' to the accomplices - on the one hand she would be removed as the focal rallying point in the event of a popular uprising and, on the other, her destruction would provide the confederates with personal material wealth and gain:

... So könnten wir vns auch desto besser begrasen,
vnd vnsern Weitzen schneiden, Dann die Heuser vnd
Vorwercke, so sie dann einbehielte, kommen vns
eben recht zu passe. (IV, 3:361)

The accomplices determine that Probus, Pudica, his pregnant wife, and Innocens, their child, must also be killed along with Patientia and the old duke: "Das erstlich ewer Vater vnnd Mutter, Vnd darnach ewers Bruders Son, Alsdann sein Weib, vnd dann letztlich ewer Bruder, vber die

halbe gereumet werde ..." (IV, 4:363). This bloodbath is necessary in order to ensure that Nero attains full control of the title to the dukedom. Nero elaborates on his plans for killing his father and engineers a trap for his mother so that he may cut her throat with her own dagger. His knowledge of his father's habits allows him to choose a time and place which will permit him to carry out his murderous plot without detection:

Vnd so weis ich wol, Das niemands mehr inn den
Garten kommen wird, auch kommen darff, als meine
Mutter, Dann ich weis meines Vatern brauch wol ... (IV, 4:364)

Heinrich Julius shows the love and trust which exists between the old couple through Nero's remarks which reveal that his mother was the only person whom his father allowed into the garden whenever he took his afternoon nap, only Patientia being permitted to disturb the husband, even the state counsellors being excluded. Not only does Nero have an intimate knowledge of his father's habits, but he also correctly predicts the horror which his mother will express upon finding her husband and grandson dead, and is aware of the general nature of the reaction which the counsellors will exhibit upon Patientia's death:

Wann sie dann kompt, wird sie die Toden liegen sehen,
Vnd darob ohne allen zweiffel sich entsetzen ... Wann
sie dann also gefunden werden, wird jedermann meinen,
Sie haben sich vber diese beide Todtfälle also entsetzt,
vnd aus zweiffelmuth das leben genommen ... (IV, 4:364)

Patientia's actual stage appearance is of the briefest duration. Upon hearing the voice of her murdered husband being cleverly simulated by her youngest son, Patientia enters the garden. According to Heinrich Julius' stage directions, Patientia is overwhelmed by the grisly scene: "Wie sie den Toden sihet, erschrecket sie hefftig, vnd fellet zur Erden" (IV, 9:371). Patientia can only express her sorrow in "Ach, Hilff Gott,

wie gehet das jmm̃er zu" (IV, 9:371). As Nero steals up to her and takes her knife, Patientia suddenly realizes the enormity of her son's depravity. She must now plead for her own life:

... Ach bedencke doch, das ich dich vñter meinem
Hertzen getragen, Mit schmerzten geboren, Vnd mit
meinen Brůsten geseuget habe. Ach mein lieber Sohn,
Ich bitte dich, las mich doch leben, Was ist dir mit
meinem Tode geholffen? Ach lieber Sohn, gedencke
doch, Wie saur du mir worden bist, ehe dann ich
dich zur Welt geboren habe. (IV, 9:371)

However, no amount of entreaty, which extends even to reminding her son of the difficulty she experienced at his birth, is able to deflect the murderer from his predetermined course of action and, as Nero stabs her, she entrusts her soul to Christ.

Nero's prediction of the reaction that ensues following the death of his first three victims proves to be accurate. Probus' horror at finding his mother brutally butchered is expressed thus:

O liebe Mutter, O liebe Mutter, Mus ich euch hie
so sehen, Nicht als einen Menschen, Sondern wie
ein Schwein oder Ochsen, ... Todt ligen sehen ... (V, 2:375)

Probus, wondering at the 'kűhnheit' of the person who killed a defenseless woman in such a manner, finally concludes that he cannot do anything about the murders, since whatever he did would bring neither his dead parents nor his murdered son back to life. Probus is desolate over the loss of his mother: "Ach, Was sol ich doch nun machen? Wem sol ich meine noth klagen? Bey wem sol ich hűlff vnd rath suchen?" (V, 2:375), for with the death of his mother Probus has lost the advisor and mentor to whom his father entrusted him. Probus' desolation is underscored by the outrage expressed by the state counsellors. However, just as Nero has predicted, they too conclude that Patientia was not slain but committed suicide out of 'zweiffelmuth' over the death of her husband

and her grandson.

Only two people now remain to be eliminated - Probus and his pregnant wife, Pudica. Pudica is to be removed by means of poison, which the doctor assures Nero is only "auff ein Frawes Person zugerichtet" (V, 6:381). Nero is to smear this poison on an apple because it is known that "weil sie schwanger ist, zu denselben noch ein grösser begirde tragen als vorhin" (V, 6:381). In order to rouse Pudica out of her melancholy state over the recent happenings, both Probus and Nero persuade her to take a walk in the garden. Pudica consents only because she wants an apple. As she comments upon the beauty of the apple, she sniffs at it and soon feels so ill that she must be carried into the house. The poison is manifestly effective. The Duke's portrayal of the love which exists between Probus and his wife is presented in cameo form. He shows Probus both concerned for the health of his pregnant wife and grief stricken upon her death:

Kan auch ein elender Mensch leben als ich? ... Mein
liebes Weib ist mit der Frucht, da ich nicht anderst
gehoffet, sie solte mich wieder erfrewen, plötzlichen,
vnd vnuersehenlicher weise geblieben. ... Ists möglich,
das einem ein grösser Creutz köndte auff erlegt werden,
als ich jetzundt tragen mus. ... (VI, 2:385)

Not only has he lost his son, but his hopes for another heir have been cruelly dashed with the death of his wife. Probus now bears the overwhelming burden of trying to endure the heavy blows which fate has rapidly and cruelly dealt him through the sudden and terrible loss of all of his family.

With Probus' murder one might expect Nero to take up the conduct of his affairs as intended upon his accession to the title. However, such is not to be the case. The ghosts of those he has cruelly murdered appear to haunt him. Of them all his mother's ghost is the most vehement

and fiercely demanding of retribution and vengeance:

Wehe, Wehe dir Mutter vnd Vater Mörder, Das du mich,
als ich dich bate, nicht erhören woltest, wehe dir,
der du nicht bedacht, wie sawr du mir geworden seist,
ehe ich dich zur Welt geboren, Vnd darumb schreye ich
Ceter Mordio vber dich von diesem vnschuldigen Bluth,
das du vergossen hast. (VI, 13:396)

Having finally comprehended the enormity of his crimes and the error of his ways, Nero vainly attempts suicide and is finally reduced to calling upon the devil to free him from his anguish by taking him into eternal damnation, which the devil obligingly does.

Chapter 4

THE WOMAN AS PORTRAYED IN THE TRAGI-COMEDIES

Introduction

This chapter will center upon an examination of Heinrich Julius' two versions of the Susanna theme: 1) TRAGICA COMEDIA HIBELDEHA. Von der Susanna, Wie dieselbe von Zweyen Alten, Ehebruchs Halber, Fälschlich Beklaget, Auch Vnschüldig Verurtheilet, Aber Entlich Durch Sonderliche Schickung Gottes Des Almechtigen von Daniele Errettet, Vnd die Beiden Alten zum Tode Verdammet Worden; and 2) TRAGICA COMEDIA HIDBELEPIHALA. Von der Susanna, Wie dieselbe Fälschlich von Zweyen Alten des Ehebruchs Beklaget, Auch Vnschüldig Verurtheilet, Aber Entlich Durch Schickung Gottes Des Almechtigen vom Daniele Errettet, Vnd die Beiden Alten Zum Tode Verdampt Worden.

Both versions of the Susanna theme noted above were printed in 1593, although it is generally agreed that Heinrich Julius wrote the longer version, the Tragica Comedia HIBELDEHA (hereinafter referred to as Version A) prior to his completion of the shorter, drastically pruned version, the Tragica Comedia HIDBELEPIHALA (hereinafter referred to as Version B) (Grimm, 1856; Pilger, 1880; Brüggenmann, 1926; Knight, 1946 and 1948; Cardoza, 1968; Casey, 1976). Furthermore, there is also general agreement with respect to Heinrich Julius' plagiaristic reliance on Frischlin's Susanna version (Grimm, 1856; Pilger, 1880; Brüggenmann, 1926; Knight, 1946; Newald, 1960; Emmrich, 1965; Cardoza, 1968; Casey, 1976). Tittmann (1880;xviii) appears to be the sole exponent of the view that, despite familiarity with many of the earlier Susanna drama-

tizations, Heinrich Julius did not copy from any of them to any significant extent.

Agreement is found in the critical literature not only with respect to the order in which the two versions were written but also, in general terms, in the critical assessment of the longer version. Pilger (1880: 190) asserts that:

... das stück des herzogs ist nichts, als eine teils freiere, teils wörtlich sich anlehrende bearbeitung des Frischlinschen dramas, welche mit solchem ungeschick gemacht ist, dass sie in fast allen wesentlichen beziehungen diesem bei weitem nachsteht, ja zum teil gradezu eine verhumzung desselben genant werden muss.

Indeed, Pilger (1880:204-205) goes on to conclude that, other than Heinrich Julius' innovative use of prose, the Susanna dramatization cannot be considered as an original contribution in that it clearly represents a case of plagiarism:

... wir haben diesen unbekannten helfer des herzogs, der a priori ein Engländer sein musste, in Frischlin gefunden: grade in allen jenen gerühmten beziehungen ist Heinrich Julius nichts als der plagiator desselben und noch dazu , ... ein ebenso leichtfertiger als ungeschickter.

Knight (1946:166; 1948:57) considers the long "A" version to be not only a 'monstrosity' but also a work of which most of the parts appear to be totally redundant. In Knight's assessment:

For Susanna A is a monstrosity. In Holland's edition it occupies no less than one hundred and seventy pages, as against a maximum of sixty-six for the next longest play, Von einem ungeratenen Sohn; of its thirty-four parts the great majority are quite unnecessary; it contains more pointless, wearisome, intolerable repetition, more crass moralizing, more trite didacticism, than all the Duke's other plays put together; and it possesses at least three plots which have really nothing to do with one another. Nor is it to any substantial degree original, either in conception or execution.

Cardoza (1968:50) concludes that Heinrich Julius' dramatic arrangement

'is singularly poor'; Casey (1976:118), while supporting the views of Pilger (1880), Knight (1946; 1948) and Cardoza (1968), also takes issue with the 'monumental length' of Version A:

... it is monumental in length, consists of 170 pages and contains thirty-four parts, some rather unnecessary, others needlessly padded. It is in no real sense original and the three plots are so poorly correlated that they create the impression that they were conceived quite apart from one another.

In his commentary Casey (1976:121-123) not only 'echoes' Knight (1946: 169-171; 1948:63-66) in an almost verbatim analysis and evaluation of the longer version but also matches Pilger's (1880) acerbic comments by expressing the view that "crude and inept copying of Frischlin's play recurs throughout the entire drama".

1) Susanna: Version A

The substance of the lengthy two-page prologue and of the first act of Version A have been the source of debate and speculation regarding the possible occasion for the initial performance of the play. Grimm (1856:147) asserts that the address delivered to various social classes in the prologue speaks for its having been performed during the wedding festivities associated with Heinrich Julius' second marriage. Brügge-mann (1926:13) disagrees with Grimm when he contends that in addressing the audience the Duke merely follows an already established literary tradition. Cardoza (1968:49), however, concurs with Grimm, observing that Heinrich Julius' lengthy reflections and advice pertaining to matters of love and marriage provide sufficient evidence in support of the conclusion that Version A must have been performed during the festiv-

ities surrounding the Duke's second marriage.

The prologue of Version A not only addresses itself to a wide variety of classes, but also draws our attention towards the epilogue for further instruction concerning the moral lessons to be learned from the play.

Act I opens with Helkia's praise and thanksgiving for his good fortune in having secured the marriage of his daughter Susanna to a rich and pious man. His comments clearly reveal that Susanna has always been a 'gehorsame Tochter', a role which he expects her to maintain. 'Being dutiful' is equated by the father with bringing "Frewde, wonne, vnd gute eintracht" (I, 1:5) and with placidly accepting parental advice. Although the daughter is now married (and theoretically dependent upon and responsible to her husband), the parents conclude that their advanced years permit them to reiterate and underscore their previously taught precepts regarding proper feminine conduct. Despite the confidence which the parents have regarding Susanna's continued exemplary conduct, Anna, Susanna's mother, expresses the feeling that a little additional cautionary advice can never be regarded as superfluous: "Doch können erinnerungen vnd vermanungen nicht zuuiel geschehen" (I, 1:7). In agreeing with a suggestion made by her husband, Anna, in her capacity as mother, expresses her own wish to speak with her daughter regarding such matters.

Susanna's first words are an apology for having kept her father waiting:

Lieber Vater, jhr wollet vnsers vertzugs halber,
keinen verdrus tragen, dann jhr könnet wol er-
achten, Junge eheleute haben im anfange jhrer
Haushaltung viel zu thun. (I, 2:8)

Helkia's response is to ignore the apology and to launch into a series

of long admonitions. Indeed this led Knight (1946:169) to conclude somewhat harshly that the second scene "is nothing but a recital of commandments and catechisms, calculated ... to provoke any human being to rebel and commit every possible sin by way of protest ..." Susanna's marriage may have removed her from fatherly 'gewalt' but parental affection necessitates a renewed reminder that God must be loved, honoured, trusted and feared, because to fear God is to attain wisdom, a virtue which "Wohnet allein bei den auserwählten Weibern" (I, 2:9). Susanna's reply to her father includes a justification and underscoring of her previous, virtuous behaviour combined with the promise of continued piety: "Ich bin auch solcher Sünde je vnd alwege feind gewesen, wil mich auch mit Götlicher hülff fortan dafür zuhüten wissen" (I, 2:10).

Helkia's advice to her to ensure that she does not miss observance of the sabbath is countered by the pious reply that since Susanna has never missed a 'Gottesdienst', she would be sad to have to do so in the future because "Gottes Wort is mein höchster trost" (I, 2:11). Little does she realize at this point how sorely her faith and trust in God are to be tested in the immediate future. In reply to the admonition that father and mother are to be honoured, the obedient and dutiful daughter says:

Ich hoffe auch, lieber Vater, das ich solches noch bis dahero gethan. Ich wil mich auch ferner mit Gottes hülff befeleissigen, das ich euch zum zorn nicht vrsach geben möchte. Vnd da ichs schon aus Jugendt vnd Menschlicher schwachheit vnwissentlich gethan hette, bitte ich, jhr wollet mir solches Väterlich zu gute halten. (I, 2:11)

It becomes patently obvious at this point that Susanna is dominated by her father, because with each additional item of fatherly advice, she either justifies her past behaviour or apologizes for any supposed

infractions of the accepted ethical and spiritual codes. Susanna appears to want to enter into a meaningful dialogue with her father, but the latter pays little attention to her statements, continuing his own remarks at the point where he left off before Susanna's comments interpose. One gains the distinct impression that Helkia is not as interested in Susanna's replies as he is in listening to his own sermonizing as his voice drones endlessly along. This behaviour has undoubtedly contributed to making wife and daughter appear to be obedient and placid, since they are usually ineffectual in the face of the verbal avalanche of the father.

Helkia firmly believes that "ein Tugentsam Weib ... ein edle Gabe [ist], vnd wird dem gegeben, der Gott fürchtet, er sey Reich oder Arm, so ist es jhme ein Trost, vnd machet jhn allzeit frölich" (I, 2:12). In this connection, it is worth noting that Helkia, and therefore by association Heinrich Julius, considered the virtuous wife to be a gift bestowed only upon those who believe in God. Helkia expounds a point of view similar to that which we have already seen expressed by Gallichoraea that the wife's duty is to make the husband happy. Helkia's entire lecture to his daughter is based upon the premise that a woman must be virtuous and having been virtuous she is then bestowed by God upon a God-fearing husband, her principal *raison d'être* then being to make him happy. Womanly virtue is then defined not only in terms of the husband's happiness but also in terms of the wife's silence:

Einn Weib das schweigen kan, das ist ein Gabe
Gottes, Ein wolgezogen Weib, ist nicht zubezahlen
... vnnd wen einer ein böß Weib hat, so ist es
eben als ein vngleich par Ochsen, die neben ein
ander ziehen sollen, Wer sie krieget, der krieget
einen Scorpion. (I, 2:120)

According to this male viewpoint, virtue and silence in a woman are to be

praised, whereas women who dare to speak their minds are described as 'böß' and are compared with scorpions - a view subscribed to this day by all the Archie Bunkers of this world. It is clear that any union of male and female under such conditions is not predicated upon equality but upon subjugation of the female. It is her duty to make the marriage work by acknowledging the supposed superiority of her husband and by refraining from any show of disapproval or anger.

At the point where one may justifiably conclude that Susanna is her father's puppet, she surprises us by a brief show of spirit in her reply to the latest admonition that she refrain from any display of anger:

"So genaw gehet es leider nicht her, man vertzürnet sich vnterweilen. Ich wahre mich aber das ich den Zorn bey mir nicht veraltern lasse"

(I, 2:13). This tiny step taken by Susanna in daring to correct her father is, however, immediately followed by her assurance that she will not remain angry for long and that her father's advice will be heeded.

Having demanded virtue, silence and the suppression of anger, Helkia goes on to warn Susanna against 'schentlichen Hoffarth' and adultery. Whereas the former is the basis of all sin, the latter precludes entry into heaven, incurring God's just wrath. A pious, virtuous wife graces the household:

Es ist nicht liebers, dann ein züchtig Weib, vnd
ist nichts köstlichers, dann ein keusches Weib, Wie
die Sonne, wann sie auffgegangen ist im hohen Himmel
des HERRN, ein zierde ist, Also ist auch ein Tugend-
sam Weib ein zierde in jhrem Hause. Ein schönes Weib,
das fromb bleibet, ist wie die helle Lampen auff dem
heiligen Leuchter. (I, 2:14)

But "... ein Hurisch weib kennet man bey jhren Augen" (I, 2:14).

Piety and virtue must, however, be matched by an absence of slander and lying, factors which would effectively preclude the maintenance of

an honourable life. Susanna's reply to all of this is prophetic, as subsequent events reveal:

... ein falscher Zeuge bleibt nicht vngestraftt.
Darumb mir leid sein solte, jemand seinen guten
Namen zu krencken. GOtt bewahre vns jha aller-
seits auch flür Lügenmeulern vnd falschen
Zungen. (I, 2:15)

However, even if all of the admonitions to which she is subjected are followed scrupulously, the observance of the standards of conduct indicated therein cannot ensure certainty of continued good fortune, since God appears to be predisposed towards the reversal of man's condition on an *ad hoc* basis:

Liebes Kind, verlas dich nicht auff dein gros glück,
wenn dirs wolgethet, so gedencke, das es dir wieder
vbel gehen kan, Vnd wenn dirs vbel gethet, so gedencke,
das es dir wieder wol gehen kan ... (I, 2:16)

Once again an ominously prophetic note is set by the statement. We, while privy to Susanna's good fortune, begin to suspect that her condition may suddenly change for the worse, while at the same time we also know that, ultimately, Susanna will triumph. Heinrich Julius foreshadows the common Baroque idea of the wheel of fortune in this statement.

Anna's promised participation in giving the admonitions is held in abeyance whilst Helkia dominates the floor. If one subsequently expects to hear more down to earth and practical advice regarding household matters from the mother, one is sorely disillusioned. Anna concurs with her husband and limits herself to suggesting "richte vnd stelle dein gantzes leben darnach an, so wird es dir wolgehen, daran darffstu dir keinen zweiffel machen" (I, 2:16). Up to this point the action has been dominated by Helkia, but Susanna is at last allowed to express herself at some considerable length. Her speech, a paean of thanks - to her parents and to God - concludes with a request for wisdom:

... das ich mein leben nach ewrer vermanung mit
Göttlicher hülff also möge anstellen, das zufo-
derst Gottes des Allmechtigen Name vnd Ehre hie-
durch gesucht, vnd dann auch jhr ein begnügtes
gefallen daran haben möget ... (I, 2:17)

Although Heinrich Julius has been severely criticized for the long-windedness and inappropriateness of this second scene (Pilger, 1880; Knight, 1946 and 1948; Casey, 1976), it must be pointed out that despite the consequent retardation and delaying of the beginning of the actual plot, Heinrich Julius does manage, through the statements of the characters, to hint at the direction the play will subsequently take. Admittedly the actual build-up is tedious by modern standards; however, one cannot help but be aware that such extensive 'stage-setting' can only signify that something will go awry. Heinrich Julius does not express his ideas concerning the proper role of the dutiful wife as fully anywhere else in his works. Helkia's sermons serve not only to highlight Heinrich Julius' ideas regarding women as daughters, wives and mothers, but also to illustrate, in a practical way, that Helkia's numerous admonitions regarding virtue, piety, sobriety and modesty have not been in vain, for his daughter continues to remain virtuous, pious and modest, despite all of the efforts of her would-be seducers.

Toward the end of Act I, scene three we are finally alerted to the impending dilemma. Midias (later called Midian), an eighty-year-old judge, has fallen in love. Comparing love to an illness which transcends all illnesses: "... Die Liebe lest einem Menschen an keinem orth zu frieden" (I, 3:36), he concludes that it turns a person's head so much that "... er weder auff Gottes gnad vnd Verheissung, viel weniger auff Gottes Zorn, Drewung vnd straffe gedencket ..." (I, 3:36). This demonic possession explains why later on Midian remains unmoved by Susanna's

pleas. The many serious afflictions he has endured pale into insignificance in comparison with this manifestation of love, an admission which echoes sentiments of the Minnesang: "Es hat mir alle meine Sinne, witz vnd verstandt dermassen beraubet, das ich nicht weis, was ich thue ... Vnd bin eben, als wenn ich in den dritten Himel verzückt were" (I, 3:37), indeed his infatuation for Susanna has reached an unbearable level:

... so werde ich durch die Liebe vnd vnkeusche begirde, die ich gegen die Susannam ... dermassen genstiget, das mir alle meine gedanken, witz, sinn vnd vernunft, Ja Gesichte vnd Gehör vergehet, vnd weis für angst nicht, wor ich aus oder ein soll. (I, 3:37)

Midian's 'vnkeusche begirde' demands sexual gratification:

... das Hertze ist auch in mir gegen jhr entzündet, das ich von jhr nicht lassen kan, es sey dann, das ich meinen willen an jhr vollbracht. (I, 3:37)

From such remarks it is clear that, in this instance, Heinrich Julius considers 'love' to be dominated and defined by a naked sexual drive, an 'aberration' which again manifests itself in the later play, the Buler vnd Bulerin, in the 'madness' which possesses Pamphilus in his desire for the beautiful Dina.

Midian is not alone in his illicit desire - his colleague Simeon echoes Midian's sentiments by informing us of his own feelings of passion toward Susanna "daß mir das Hertze im Leibe brennet. Denn wenn ich in jhr Hause komme, vnd ich sie sehe, möchte ich schier für angst zerbersten" (II, 1:43). Although Simeon's long-standing pursuit of the lady has met with a singular lack of success, he feels that this is mainly due to the fact that Susanna is constantly surrounded either by her maids or by her husband, and he is hopeful that Iojakim's absence from home augurs favourably for the expeditious final resolution of his

problem. Simeon, like Midian, is no longer content with observation from a distance:

Nun ich wil ... des Gelucks erwarten, ob ich
einmal mein muthlein an jr külen vnd mein
altes Hertz laben vnd erfrischen möchte,

although he immediately adds that:

wenn ich sie nur sehen möchte, als wie sie auff
die Welt komen ist, ich würde etzlicher massen
mein lust gebüßet haben. (II, 1:43)

Both Simeon and Midian again intend to lie in wait for Susanna as before. Reiterating Simeon's sentiments that "ich habe offtmals an diesem orte auff die Susannam, ob ich sie zu Worten bekommen möchte, gelauret" (II, 1:43-44), Midian hides behind a tree. Midian's cough betrays his presence to Simeon and the two are soon engaged in a verbal fencing match, each trying to hide from the other the real reason for his presence in Susanna's garden (II, 1:44-53). Midian finally comes to the conclusion that, if their mutual suspicions concerning each other's presence in the garden are justified, perhaps the reason for their continued presence is debatable: "Die gedanken stimmen recht vberlein, sollen auch wol die vrsachen, darumb wir so oft hierkommen vberlein stimmen" (II, 1:51). Midian eventually confesses that Susanna's beauty has led him to fall in love with her: "... wenn ich sie sehe, brenet mir das Hertz im Leibe, Vnd wenn ich sie nicht sehe, so habe ich doch ein solche angst, das ich nicht weis, wo ich aus oder ein sol" (II, 1:53). Simeon finally admits that the reason for his own presence in the garden is to effect a *rendez-vous* and goes on to suggest that his love for Susanna is perhaps the greater, for he is younger than Midian.

Since both are in agreement in thought as well as in proposed deed, Simeon cavalierly suggests that they combine forces and share subsequent-

ly in the spoils. To ensure their success Simeon proposes:

Wir wollen vns beide im Garten mit einander ver-
stecken, vnd wenn sie dann zu baden in den Garten
kommen wird, vnd allein ist, wollen wir sie zugleich
anfallen, vnd mit gewalt bezwingen. (II, 1:54)

In Version A Simeon appears to be the more ruthless and determined of the two, having an immediate answer for each of Midian's hesitant protests, especially the one relating to Midian's concern about Susanna's possible resistance to their importunities:

Wo fern sie sich weigern vnd schreyen wird, so
wollen wir auch ein geschrey machen, vnd sagen,
wir haben sie im Ehebruch mit einem jungen Gesellen
gefunden, vnd wollen zugleich vber sie zeugen. (II, 1:55)

Little does Susanna suspect that her expressed hope of being spared from calumny is about to be shattered: "Gott bewahre vns jha allerseits auch für Lügenmeulern vnd falschen Zungen" (I, 2:15).

Appearing for only the second time, Susanna manifests surprise and concern about the lack of news of her absent husband: "Es nimbt mich wunder, das ich von meinem Manne kein zeitung bekommen. Ich hoffe ja nicht, das jhme was zu kommen sey" (II, 2:55). Her concern is such that she decides to take the initiative by sending a servant to visit the husband not only in order to transmit assurances of the family's well-being but also to bring back news of her husband's own situation. In the light of our understanding of Midian's and Simeon's evil intentions, the transmission of such a message to the husband at this point would indeed appear to be premature and ironic. Susanna's plaintive concern is underscored by her repeated urgings that the servant, Sichar, run quickly "damit ich baldt möge zeitung bekommen, wie es meinem Manne gehet ... vnd dencke seume dich nicht" (II, 2:56). One gains the impression that this is an extraordinary occurrence as far as her

husband is concerned, a husband who apparently never failed to inform his family of his status and health during his absences.

Following the dispatch of the servant and apparently plagued by the intense heat, Susanna decides to bathe in the garden, little suspecting what awaits her there. Pilger (1880:195) somewhat unjustifiably criticises Heinrich Julius' use of motive and construction of the bath scene. He feels that Frischlin's motivation (Susanna's expressed desire to beautify herself for her husband's return) for Susanna's bath provides a reason rather more plausible than that of Heinrich Julius who indicates that Susanna is bathing in order to refresh herself on a hot day. However, in his construction of the scene, Heinrich Julius stresses Susanna's piety. The maid's comment that Susanna will appeal more to her husband after a refreshing bath, allows Susanna to indicate her virtue, piety and complete assimilation of her father's admonitions:

Das mag leicht, das ich meinem Manne gefalle, zarte
Haut vnnnd schönes Gesichte, das sind vergengliche
dinge. Aber Gottes Furche, Zucht vnd Erbarkeit, ist
die beste vnd bestendigste schöne, die ein Frawe,
jhrem Manne damit zugefallen, an sich haben sol. (II, 2:56)

It is obvious that Susanna has dutifully adopted Helkia's viewpoints as her own. It is equally clear that Susanna would never use make-up in order to enhance her natural beauty in the same way as Dina, who begged Pamphilus to instruct her in the intricacies and subtleties of French make-up. Instead Susanna parrots her father as she corrects Ludith, her second maid, by pointing out that natural beauty combined with piety "ist ein schöne zierde, vnd ein Man hat freude an jhr" (II, 2:57). It is evident that Susanna has accepted her father's precepts. In Suanna's eyes external transitory beauty counts for little in comparison with constant piety and chastity, because the latter is infinitely

more durable and desirable than artifices which may be washed away with a sprinkling of water:

Denn die schöne ist vergänglich, vnd kan auch eines theils, wenn sie durch verbotene mittel zuwege gebracht, mit Wasser abgewaschen werden. Tugent, Zucht vnd Erbarkeit aber bleibet bestendig biß ans ende. (II, 2:57)

Intent upon refreshing herself by bathing, Susanna nevertheless remains mindful of her duties as chatelaine by sending her maid Sara back into the house in order to ensure that everything is ready for the return of her husband, thereby ensuring that his return is not marred by his possible anger over some omission in the preparations - a clear demonstration of the wife's deference to the husband. Iudith, who is also sent back into the house in order to fetch soap and balsam for Susanna's bath, is strongly admonished to ensure that the gate is securely locked so that none may intrude upon Susanna and offend her sense of modesty by seeing her naked. Having temporarily divested herself of her servants' protection, however, Susanna lays herself open and becomes vulnerable to Midian's and Simeon's attack. Commenting upon the intense heat, Susanna, thinking herself secure from prying eyes, is preparing to undress when she suddenly becomes aware of voices:

Ach Gott, ach Gott, wie gehet das jmmmer zu. Ach da ist ein Mans Person. ... Ach, Ach, das ich doch meine Magt bey mir hette. (II, 3:59)

Too late she realizes the nature of the predicament in which she has been caught. As Midian approaches, she pleads desperately with him not to inflict any outrage upon her but rather, should he wish to speak with her, to meet her in the house. Susanna's attempt to persuade Midian to abandon his intentions of speaking with her about 'geheime Sachen' is abortive. Although Dina cared little for the opinion of

people concerning her amorous escapades with Pamphilus, Susanna's sole concern, in contrast, is for her reputation and for her husband's reaction to the situation:

Was wollen die Leute sagen, wenn sie es hören
werden. Was wolte mein Man dencken, wenn er vns
so flünde. Vnd jtzunder wird mein Magt auch wieder
kommen, wenn sie das sihet, wird sie mich vnnd
euch in ein falsch geschrey bringen. (II, 3:60)

All appeals to reason and to his better nature continue to fall on Midian's deaf ears, as he adamantly refuses to honour Susanna's 'Frauen Ehre' by leaving her alone. Seeing Simeon, she feels at first that he might save her: "Ach Simeon errettet mich doch" (II, 3:61), but discovers to her horror that Simeon shares Midian's base intentions: "Ach Simeon gehet doch von mir, damit jhr mir kein böse Gerüchte machen möget" (II, 3:61). Her weak and ineffectual pleas drastically illustrate how ill-prepared her parental training has left her for coping with the unenviable situation in which now she finds herself. Neither education nor personal inclination have taught her to assert herself and, in consequence, her efforts on her own behalf rapidly weaken. Like the cornered prey which suddenly realizes the possible nature of its fate, Susanna manifests a semblance of submission in the hope that she will find an opportunity to escape. A measure of her previously manifested vigour returns only in response to Simeon's bullying attempt to force her to sit down, to which she responds by protesting that it is unseemly for an honest woman to be found sitting with male strangers. Despite her reluctance to listen to what her two seducers have to say, Midian finally forces Susanna to listen to their dishonourable proposal. As the full import of their words dawns upon her, Susanna is finally roused to anger and indignation: "Was sagstu Erloser vnerschempter

verzweiffelter Bube, woltestu vmb Beyschlaffen bey mir anhalten?"

(II, 3:62). With Simeon's confirmation of her assessment, Susanna immediately turns to God for succor and for deliverance from such unmitigated knavery. Her categoric and emphatic refusal to give in: "Ey das hörestu wol, du loser alter B^üsewicht, das ichs nicht thun wil"

(II, 3:62) is predicated upon her firm belief that such action not only runs counter to God's will but also constitutes a gross deception of her husband. Her initial assertive indignant outburst finally gives way to a defensive reliance upon God's commandments: "Ach jhr Ehrlosen Buben, gedencket jhr nicht daran, wie GOtt den Ehebruch vnd Hurerey verboten, vnd zu straffen gedrewet hat" (II, 3:63). Not even dramatic reminders of such calamitous manifestations of heavenly retribution as the Deluge and of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, prove to be deterrents for Simeon and Midian who single-mindedly strive to attain their objective. True to his previously expressed contempt for God's wrath (I, 3:36), Midian flippanantly counters: "Was gehet mich Sodoma vnd Gomorra an, wir sind jtzunder hie in deinem Garten zu Babylon" (II, 3:63). Indeed, after continuing in a similar vein, Midian finally threatens in exasperation: "Du bist grausam heilig, aber höre vns ist mit deinem schnattern nicht gedienet, Erklere dich, ob du vnsern willen gutwillig thun wilt oder nicht" (II, 3:64). Susanna's adamant refusal to capitulate in face of this threat is predicated not only upon the basis of the love and troth which she has given to her husband but also upon the assumption that even though one may remain unobserved by others, God is watching constantly. Giving way at first to self-pity: "Ach ich Armes betrübtes Mensch, wie kome ich doch vnter diese verrederische Buben" (II, 3:65), Susanna sends another plea heavenward but finally ex-

plodes: 'hörstu es wol du Heilloser verreter, las mich zu frieden"

(II, 3:65). She then orders him in no uncertain terms to pack himself off:

Schemestu dich nicht, das du alß ein alter Mann vnd
Stutze des Rades, vnd ein fürnhemer vnter den Rich-
tern, heimlich in den garten schleichst ... dencke
vnd laß mich vnangerlret, vnd packe dich an die Orter
da du zuschaffen hast. (II, 3:65)

Simeon, realizing the futility of their combined pleas, bullying and threats, switches to a different tack by revealing their trump card:

Hörestu Susanna, ich rathe dir, das du dich bewegen
lasset, wiltu es aber nicht thun, so ist vnser zwey,
so wollen wir dich mit gewalt dazu zwingen. Vnd da
du es dennoch nicht thun, vnd dich weigern würdest,
so wollen wir beide aus einem Maul wieder dich zeugen,
und dich beschuldigen, das wir dich in Ehebruch mit
einem jungen gesellen gefunden haben ... (II, 3:66)

At this point the two vicious old lechers appear almost pathetic in their efforts to reinforce each other despite the dastardly nature of their plot to assault a lone and defenseless woman. It is little wonder that Susanna, realizing the magnitude of their evil, feels only dismay as she comprehends the enormity of the trap they have set for her:

O ich elendes Mensch ... so ferne ich euch folge,
bin ich des Ehebruchs vnd Tods schuldig. Wo ichs
euch aber abschlage, ... so werde ich doch aus ewren
Henden nicht kommen. Ach was sol ich armes verlassenes
Weib thun? (II, 3:66)

True to her father's teachings, Susanna chooses to die innocent rather than be party, however reluctantly, to such a crime: "... So wil ich doch lieber vnschuldig sterben, als das ich GOtt im himmel durch dieses grosses Laster erzürnen sollte" (II, 3:66-67). As Simeon and Midian lay their hands on her, she shrieks for help from her servants. Totally frustrated by their failure to realize their plan, Simeon and Midian vow to revenge themselves upon Susanna for their lack of success:

... du solt doch gleichwol für eine Huren vnd Ehebrecherin in dieser Stadt ausgeschreiet, vnd derhalben zum Todte verdampt werden, Das sey dir ein Eidt geschworen. (II, 3:67)

As Susanna flees from her would-be assailants, Simeon bombards the servants with slanderous innuendo. Savouring every detail and moment of his perverse game, he allows the servants, finally, to elicit the details of the false 'news' from him. The incredulity and disbelief of the servants is exemplified by Hiramus' exclamations: "... ich kan es viel weniger glauben, dann desgleichen hat man ja vorhin niemals von jhr gehört. ... ich glaube, es müsse euch getreumet haben was jhr saget" (II, 4:72), for Hiramus is not given to believing rumours whose veracity have not been checked out by him personally. On the contrary Hiramus, as he is on his way to search for his master, in fact begins to suspect the true reason for Simeon's and Midian's denouncement:

Ich habe mir gantzlich die gedancken eingebildet, das der Teuffel vielleicht die alten beiden Buben so weit geritten hat, das sie der Susannae wor selber etwas vnehrliches angemuthet, vnd weil sie es nicht thun wollen, das sie jhr nun diese schande an den Hals wollen hengen, damit sie desto mehr aus der verdacht bleiben mögen. (III, 2:83)

Act III opens with Iojakim's expression of pleasure regarding the successful nature of his trip, coupled with an expression of his desire to return to his 'schönen vnd frommen Weibe'. Echoing his father-in-law's words, he extols beauty, chastity and piety in wives because "Ein Man kan seines Hertzen freude daran haben ..." (III, 1:81). Such women are few and far between, while those "... die sich mehr befeissen, wie sie jhren Männer etwas zuwieder als zugefallen thun mögen" (III, 1:81) constitute the majority by far. Susanna, in her refusal to alter her natural beauty by the use of make-up, has no doubt been strongly in-

fluenced by her husband who now castigates those women who "können ... mit der Natürlichen gestalt, welche ihnen Gott gegeben hat, nicht zufrieden sein. Sondern beschmieren dasselbe mit Farben vnd Schmincke ..." (III, 1:82). Iojakim's outlook and tolerance level is exemplified by his listing of the types of women who, in failing to conform to the rigid moral and aesthetic code to which he subscribes, thereby lay themselves open, in his view, to condemnation. He thanks God for his good fortune in securing such a faultless wife, such a paragon of virtue, and goes on to express his hope that "Der liebe Gott erhalte sie ferner gnediglich dabey, das sie sich wie sie angefangen, auch ferner also erzeigen möge" (III, 1:82).

At this point one begins to wonder whether Iojakim will be able to withstand the shock of hearing the vicious rumours which are being spread about his wife. Our worst fears are confirmed as Hiramus reluctantly transmits the news concerning Susanna. Iojakim's concern is not so much for his wife as for his own reputation: "O hilff Gott, welch ein vnglück ist das. ... Ach nun mus ich sterben. Ach, ach ich armer Man. Wer ich doch nie geboren ..." (III, 2:85), an expression typical of a time when husbands were thought to suffer a loss of honour if the wife behaved in an adulterous manner. Hiramus shows more common sense and compassion for his mistress than Iojakim is able to muster for his wife:

... bekümmert euch doch nicht so sehr, vnd gleubet den falschen Reden doch nicht, Sondern höret doch erst ewere Frauen auch darauff. Ihr wisset ja wol, das sie sich allezeit ehrlich vnd richtig erzeiget ... das sie allzeit Gottfürchtig, Fromb vnd auffrichtig gewesen ... (III, 2:85)

Iojakim, shamed into agreeing with Hiramus, cannot refrain from adding petulantly: "... den schimpff aber hab ich gleich wol weg, vnd werde in wol behalten" (III, 2:86). Hiramus then attempts to ameliorate the

situation by reiterating the suggestion that Iojakim should speak first with Susanna and her parents before lending any credence to the vicious rumours. Because he is well aware of Susanna's 'Tugent vnd Frömbkeit', Iojakim finally condescends to agree that he "wil ... [sich] jhrer, als ein getrewer Ehemann annehmen ..." (III, 2:86), preferring to seek the advice of his in-laws before comforting his wife. Moreover he prefers to die rather than be exposed to shame. Iojakim appears wooden, selfish, and totally incapable of dealing with situations which are clearly out of the ordinary. His self-concern and lack of compassion for his troubled wife leads one to surmise that the marriage is not so much based upon mutual love and affection as upon Susanna's submission to her husband's expectations of her, coupled with her adherence to the virtuous 'path' chosen for her by her husband.

Pilger (1880:199) believes that Heinrich Julius handled this scene clumsily. Cardoza (1968:54) concurs with this point of view in assessing Iojakim's speeches as mechanical utterances totally devoid of feeling, speeches which make him appear as a pretentious egotist.

Anna finally brings a breath of reason into the discussion by questioning Helkia about the nature of Susanna's reaction to these rumours. Helkia typifies his failings both as father and as husband by admitting that he had not talked with Susanna about the matter. Anna, who has previously never disagreed with her husband, now expresses her own opinion by insisting that Susanna be consulted: "... wer weis, was die beiden Richter vor einen groll auff sie gefasset haben, das sie nun vermeinen, sich hiedurch an jhr zurechen" (III, 3:90). In concurring with his wife's counsel, Helkia states with overtones of condescending magnanimity "verlassen müssen wir sie nicht, biß so lange sie dermassen

vberzeuget, ... das sie des Todes schüldig" (III, 3:90). It would appear that support is to be given only if one is to be regarded as blameless. However, as soon as the community points the finger of guilt, and at the very point at which total family support is most necessary, Helkia feels justified in withdrawing that needed support. Henrich Julius has thus not deviated greatly from the Old Testament position and that of his own time in that he permits the 'guilty' person to be ostracized and shown little mercy.

Her uncertainty concerning the support, if any, which might be forthcoming from her family is underscored by Susanna's expression of the hope that her family will believe her rather than the rumours:

"... das doch mein Mann vnnd meine liebe Eltern sich von dem falschem geschrey nicht zusehr hetten einnehmen lassen ..." (III, 4:91).

Despite the tenor of her father's righteous sermons, she is keenly aware of the nature of human failings despite any number of expressions of piety. Where one might well have expected at least some measure of understanding, Susanna knows that in the final analysis she will have to bear the full burden of convincing her family of her innocence, because in her case it is a matter of being guilty until proven innocent. So profound is her distress that she is moved to offer an abject apology, combining her apology with an expression of hope that her family will believe her.

Although she is prepared to die a martyr's death, Susanna is nevertheless concerned with preserving her honour and, in order to achieve that end, she begs for the support and love of her family. In replying rather sanctimoniously that he feels sorry for her 'vnglück', Iojakim continues with:

Ich habe dich biß dahero Ehrlich vnd fromb erkant,
 wil auch nun nicht hoffen, daß du die Trewe in mei-
 nem abwesen werdest vergessen haben. (III, 4:92)

Susanna reminds Iojakim of her enduring love and faith and evokes a promise from him that ultimately he will not fail her. Her father utters similar sentiments as he weakly attempts to comfort her: "Sey du getrost, Gott stehet allezeit dem Gerechten bey, er wird dich auch, so ferne du vnschuldig bist, als ich hoffen wil, nicht verlassen" (III, 4:93), but even such lukewarm comfort appears to be grudgingly given.

Simeon, having initially devised the plan to ensnare Susanna, now wishes that he had neither initiated nor carried out the plot and has to be persuaded by Midian that they both must continue to present a united front. Although he is now hesitant, coaxing by Midian leads Simeon to agree to swear an oath to ensure Susanna's conviction and death (III, 5:96).

Prior to Susanna's trial the judges engage in a lengthy discussion about the manner in which Susanna should be brought before them, bound or unbound. Samual, one of the judges, finally suggests that she should appear unbound "vmb jhres frommen Ehrlichen Mannes willen" (IV, 1:101). However, Cleophas, the high judge, has the final word and demands that Susanna endure the ignominy of being handcuffed. Despite Susanna's and Iojakim's high standing in society, she is not to be spared the treatment normally meted out to those of lesser influence.

During the trial Midian and Simeon adhere to their concocted story. However, Susanna is given an opportunity for rebuttal by being permitted to relate her version of what happened. During this rebuttal she takes the opportunity to remind the assembly of her previous good conduct and

begs "mich derogestaldt auff diese falsche anklage nicht zum Todte verdammen" (IV, 2:106). However, since at heart she suspects that the judges will not believe her, she lapses into the submissive role typical of her training: "ich wil lieber schweigen, vnd leiden" (IV, 2:107). However, as Midian accuses her of lying, Susanna stoutly refuses to become intimidated (IV, 2:107). A lack of consensus by the judges regarding the disposition of the verdict leads to a procedural wrangle which finally involves the swearing of a profound oath by the two accusers, which results in the final decision that Simeon and Midian must be believed: "Weil sie denn nun diesen Eydt wircklich geleistet, so wird jhnen billich Glaube zugemessen ..." (IV, 4:12). This travesty of justice concludes with the delivery of a sentence by Cleophas of 'death by stoning', Midian and Simeon being accorded the first stones.

Matters have never looked more bleak for Susanna, whose inevitable and predictable reaction is to turn to God:

Weil ich dann nun keinen Menschen habe, der durch sein gegenzeugniß mich vom tode erretten, vnd diese schmach von mir nhemen könnte, denn du allein mein GOTT, So wil ich auch von aller menschen hülffe vnd Gnade, mein gemlthe abwenden vnd zu dir allein kehren. (IV, 4:122)

Although she meekly accepts her fate, she begs God to ensure that her innocence may be brought to light after her death so that her enemies may realize how much she has endured. Having accepted the verdict, she turns her concern to her family: to her parents, who, as a consequence of her death, will be castigated; to her husband, who will have to enter the 'betrübtten Widwen Standt', and to her little children.

Neither Anna, Helkia, nor Iojakim can cope with the reality of Susanna's impending execution. Their initial reaction is to wish that they had never lived to witness and endure the agony of Susanna's death.

Iojakim, as distraught as his in-laws, wants to die rather than to go on living even though he has the obligation to protect his children and Susanna's parents from further harm.

In the lengthy and sentimental farewell scene, Susanna apologizes to her father for all of her supposed youthful errors, and entrusts her husband and her children to him, and begs him "Ach mein lieber Vater nehmet mich doch noch einmal inn den Arm, Denn es wird nicht lange dahin, so werdet jhr mich nimmermehr sehen" (V, 4:125-126). Helkia, overcome with sorrow, admits to his inability to provide comfort:

Ich sollte, liebe Tochter, als dein Vater, dich
billich jetzunder trösten, vnd ein Hertz zu
sprechen, so tröstest du mich jetzundt ... ich
kann nicht thun, das ich mit dir reden kan, mein
Hertz ist mir dermassen beklummen ... (IV, 4:126)

Anna, as overwhelmed with sorrow as her husband, is also incapable of providing any comfort. Confessing that she cannot bear witness to her daughter's predicament any longer and entrusting Susanna to God's mercy, Anna abandons her. In this scene Heinrich Julius delineates a rather ironical situation - Susanna as dutiful daughter apologizes to and comforts her parents as they literally abandon her in her hour of greatest need. The irony is compounded when Susanna begs her husband not to blame her for her death! She states her conviction that she had consistently behaved in a 'freundlich, dienstbar, vnd gehorsam' manner toward him and now as her thoughts are solely directed towards ensuring his peace of mind, she encourages her husband not only to accept God's decision but also to entrust to Him the realization of just retribution for her false conviction. In anticipation of an ultimate happy reunion with her husband and family in Heaven and having divested herself of all thoughts of her earthly existence and happiness, she takes solace in

the knowledge that her life in the hereafter will more than compensate for her present troubles. The inability of the parents to provide any measure of comfort for their daughter is underscored by Iojakim's behaviour, for rather than turning to comfort his wife, he continues to dwell upon his own condition, the only comment that he proves capable of providing is to tell his wife to commit her body and soul to God.

Pilger (1880:201), who generally condemns Heinrich Julius' version of the Susanna story, surprisingly concludes that the farewell scene is relatively intimate and warm, while Werner (1976:24, 187) concludes that "Kindesliebe und -schmerz sind echt und realistisch dargestellt" and that the farewell scene is 'pathetisch'. Casey (1976:122), on the other hand, finds Susanna's farewell to her daughter to be 'excessively sentimental' and 'especially jarring'.

Although Susanna stoically dispenses hope and comfort to her parents and her husband, she is completely overwhelmed when her daughter Rebecca asks her whether she will return. Finally she admits to Rebecca that she must die. Rebecca is both child and adult - child in that she wants a 'Püßsichen', adult in her expression of hope for the revelation of her mother's innocence. Susanna is clearly near collapse:

Wer es doch kein wunder, wo mich GOTT nicht erhilte,
das ich versagen müßte ... Vnd wenn man mir mit glü-
enden Zangen das Hertze aus dem Leibe risse, köndte
mir so wehe nicht geschehen, als durch diese Worte. (IV, 4:132)

The child Daniel appears after Susanna pleads with God to permit her innocence to come to light. Inspired by God, Daniel soon shows how contradictory and false Midians' and Simeon's 'evidence' had been (IV, 4-6: 133-148) in that Midian asserts that Susanna was caught under a linden tree and Simeon testifies that it was an oak tree. Daniel also provides the peasants with the opportunity to accuse the miscreants. The verdict

of the court is rapidly reversed, the two accusers themselves then being condemned to death by stoning. Midian realizes all too late that he has outsmarted himself: "... ich habe mich in meiner eigenen klugheit bethört. Die Grube, so ich einem andern gegraben, da bin ich nuhn selber eingefallen" (IV, 7:154).

Susanna's 'miraculous' deliverance is accompanied by a long paean of thanks to God. Both Helkia and Anna are immediately grateful for the return of their daughter, although their son-in-law manifests a slower comprehension of the rapid turn of events. Although Iojakim finally begins to react to the situation by sending for his children and by asking for music, he is still so overwhelmed by all that has happened that he is only able to say: "Ach liebes Weib, ich kan für Frewde jtzundt nicht viel mit dir reden, Gott sey dafür gelobet, das ich dich dergestaldt wieder sehen mag" (IV, 4:162), for whenever Iojakim is very upset or very happy, he is consistently incapable of expressing himself.

The epilogue concludes by stressing that not only should all parents take Helkia and Anna as an example to be followed in the raising of their children, but also that all young wives should emulate Susanna's virtuous behaviour.

2) Susanna: Version B

If Version A of Susanna appears to suffer from crudity, ineptness and didacticism, the much pruned and sizably reduced Version B is, conversely, according to Casey (1976:133),

A competent play, with the distinct advantage of being easily staged ... It is the product of a more mature dramatist than the earlier version and possesses sections of good literary quality.

A surprising assessment in view of the fact that Heinrich Julius has

been charged with plagiarism with respect to this particular work. In his assessment Casey continues to support Knight's evaluation (1946:173; 1948:66), because the latter also regarded Version B as not necessarily a "great work of art, but at least ... a rapidly developed, concise,actable, competent stageplay". At the same time Casey disagrees with Grimm (1856:155), who felt that, as a consequence of this drastic pruning, Version B attained a "sehr reizloses Aussehen". Werner (1976: 49) believes that Version B is "was die erste [Version] nicht ist - spielbar an einem Tag; sie ist geordneter, geklärter, geformter. Dafür hat sie nicht mehr die ungestüme Kraft und Direktheit der ersten".

The eight roles assigned to women in Version A are reduced to five in Version B, for in eliminating the 'peasant scenes', the author also automatically eliminated the roles of the peasant women, Annecke, Lena and Walpe.

While the two-page prologue of Version A addressed itself to a wide audience, the prologue of Version B is limited to a half page and is used merely to acquaint us with the content of the play.

Heinrich Julius not only eliminated the major portion of the prologue in making his revision but he extended his drastic editorial pruning by discarding the first thirty-five pages of Version A, pages which encompassed Helkia's praise regarding Susanna's good marriage (A: I, 1), as well as his admonitions to his daughter to continue to conduct herself piously and virtuously (A: I, 2:8-17) and his interaction with his servant (A: I, 3:17-35). In Version A Heinrich Julius had utilized an elaborate 'stage-setting' in order to emphasize the nature of Susanna's dutiful and obedient feelings towards her parents, but in Version B he avoids such excesses and shuns the moralizing tone, pro-

ceeding immediately to the main action (B: I, 1:173-174) by having Midian, in a greatly reduced speech, confess his illicit love for Susanna. While Heinrich Julius demonstrated Midian's baseness in Version A (I, 3: 37-42) by means of his interaction with the peasant Hans, he suppressed this facet of Midian's character in Version B. Simeon's lengthy speech (A: II, 1:43) has also been reduced and shifted to Act I (3:175) in Version B, along with Simeon's interchange with his rival Midian.

As a result of this pruning we are introduced immediately into the middle of the plot and within a short time become aware that two old lechers plan to surprise the unsuspecting Susanna whilst she is bathing. Although Heinrich Julius developed the concept of Susanna's virtue and piety at length in Version A, these qualities are de-emphasized in his revision. Indeed, in Version B we are given merely the briefest hint from the shortened prologue: "Susannae welche doch fromb vnd Gottfürchtig gewesen ..." (Prologvs:173). Midian twice refers to Susanna's 'vberaus grossen schönheit' as having been responsible for his 'Liebe' (B: I, 1: 173; I, 4:177).

Having shown Susanna's concern for her absent husband and her piety in the interchange (in Version A) with her maid Iudith, Heinrich Julius eliminates these facets of her personality completely from Version B. In the latter version Susanna, now shown as being anxious to have a bath merely because of the great heat, is nevertheless still concerned: "Ich hoffe ja, wir sind hie alleine im Garten" (II, 1:178), demonstrating her modesty: "Vnd schliesset ja die Thür fest zu, Damit niemandts herein komme, vnd mich dergestalt sehen möge" (II, 1:179). If Pilger (1880) had levelled his criticism regarding the motivation for the bath scene at Version B rather than at Version A, as discussed previously,

we might have been able to concur with his comments.

As Susanna "beginnet sich auszuziehen" (B: II, 1:179) her would-be seducers appear. In the revision, their speeches have been partially transposed from their sequence in Version A, for as Simeon first approaches Susanna, he delivers those lines which had been attributed to Midian in Version A (II, 3), with Midian subsequently joining Simeon and Susanna. Version A's lengthy bath/intimidation/negotiation scene (II, 3:58-67) is drastically reduced to little over three pages in Version B (II, 2:179-182). While Version A at this point shows Susanna manifesting some signs of assertive behaviour in attempting to send Midian 'packing' (II, 3:65), Version B is devoid of any such manifestation.

Heinrich Julius, in reducing the denunciation scene of Version A (II, 4:67-80), which encompassed the interchange between the peasants Clas, Conrad and Hans, to a little over one page in the revision, continues to wield his editorial 'shears' in the latter by also eliminating Iojakim's interaction with his servants Sichar and Hyramus (III, 2) as well as that with his in-laws. In addition Hyramus of Version A is replaced in Version B by Johan Bouschet who now informs his master of the rumours, by relating that "Susanna av Fraw, sou ein Huer syn" (II, 4:184). Further editing occurs with the elimination of Midian's and Simeon's pact to continue acting in unison (A: III, 5:94-96), in Midian's interchange with the peasants Conrad and Clas (A: III, 5:97-99), and in the judges' scene (A: IV, 1:99-101).

Midian's and Simeon's original extended accusations against Susanna are reduced to thirteen lines in Version B and while Version A permits Susanna considerable scope to defend herself against the charges, Version

B limits her to:

Ja, das leugne ich alles, Dann du beschuldigst
mich dessen, Das du nicht gesehen, Ich auch nie
in mein Hertz genommen, Viel weniger vollenbracht
habe. (III, 2:187)

In no way does Version B pretend to allow Susanna even a semblance of justice, the handing down of the death penalty being based solely upon complete and immediate acceptance of false testimony by judges who can neither weigh nor consider a non-existent defense. Thus, with the elimination of Susanna's defense, Heinrich Julius logically also eliminated the subsequent scene in which the judges consider her case to be sufficiently inconclusive as to require the accusers to swear the 'weighty oath'.

Susanna's longest speech in Version B (III, 2:188), delivered after the pronouncement of the verdict, is a much reduced combination of the two lengthy speeches she delivered subsequent to Midian's and Simeon's oath (A: IV, 4:121-124). In Version B, Act III (3:189) opens with Anna's lament from Version A being delivered verbatim (IV, 4:124), continues with excerpts for Helkia and Iojakim and concludes with the farewell scene with Susanna's daughter Rebecca, which is also almost a verbatim transcription of the longer Version.

The appearance of the child Daniel is retained in order to provide the justice the judges failed to mete out. As a result of having eliminated the previous scenes which had been included in Version A, Heinrich Julius achieves consistency in his revision in that he also eliminates the peasants' accusations (A: IV, 5:136-142; IV, 6:146-148). It is left to Daniel to bring out the truth by testing the two old miscreants.

Just as the judges had with great facility condemned Susanna to

death, they now hand down the same verdict upon their colleagues and turn immediately towards Susanna:

Liebe Susanna, verzeihet vns s mptlich, das wir ein solch Vrtheil wieder euch gefellet haben. Wir haben den beiden Alten, als Obersten vnd Richtern, getrawet ... Ewre Widersacher werden jetzund baldt jhren verdienten lohn empfangen. (IV, 4:202)

Cleophas the high judge even goes on to state:

Kommet liebe Susanna, Weil von ewren Freunden noch niemandes hier ist, Wollen wir euch s mptlich mit freuden vnd frolocken zu Haus begleiten. (IV, 4:202)

In Version A Heinrich Julius allowed Midian and Simeon ample opportunity for expressions of repentance (IV, 7:154-156) but in the revision he shortens their speeches considerably (IV, 6:203).

Deleting but a few lines and making an obviously necessary correction, Heinrich Julius then transposed all of Act V, scene 3 from the longer version into the revision. In the original version Iojakim attempts to express his confused feelings: "Denn meine Tochter war verlohren, vnd ich habe sie wieder funden. Todt war mein Tochter, vnnd ist nun wieder lebendig worden" (A: V, 3:160). The author corrects this in the revision to read: "Dann meine Fraw war verloren, Vnd ich habe sie wieder funden, Todt war meine Fraw, Vnd ist nun wieder lebendig worden, ..." (B: Vltimi, 2:205). Susanna's speech of thanks for her deliverance (A: V, 2:159-160) is shortened to eight lines in Version B (Vltimi, 3:205) and the happy reunion with parents, husband and children consists of an almost verbatim transcription.

Although through his editing Heinrich Julius has made Version B of Susanna a more manageable play, he has at the same time reduced it to such spartan proportions that it affords us less opportunity for an evaluation of the portrayal of the woman than does Version A. For

that reason and for our purposes, Version A provides a better vehicle for analysis since it is the only play in which Heinrich Julius demonstrates his perception of the ideal wife in a positive fashion.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY

The preceeding analysis of the three groups of plays permits us to categorize the German women of the sixteenth century as portrayed by Heinrich Julius into the following classes: a) virtuous married women; b) adulteresses; c) court 'ladies' and d) peasant women.

Of all of the married women encountered, only Susanna conforms to what might be regarded as a manifestation of ideal womanhood. Heinrich Julius portrays her not only as an obedient and dutiful daughter but also as an equally pious, obedient and virtuous wife. Susanna displays deference not only to her husband Iojakim but also towards her parents Helkia and Anna at all times. Even when she is engulfed in the extremest mental anguish and spiritual torment associated with the events surrounding her apparently imminent death, she still attends to her 'duty' by giving comfort to her parents and husband, although they have literally abandoned her in her hour of greatest need. Susanna, despite all of the stresses upon her, neither falters nor deviates from her belief in God nor from the path of virtue set out for her by her parents and her husband. If God has chosen not to provide her with happiness in this life, she nevertheless remains steadfast in her conviction, that He will reward her virtue and obedience by bestowing ultimate happiness upon her by granting her reunion with her husband after death. An examination of the practical realities of her life reveals, however, that Susanna's relationship with her husband is founded not so much upon mutual love and affection as upon deference and submission to her husband. Any warmth displayed appears to be one-sided, Iojakim being far too pre-

occupied in selfishly bemoaning his own fate to be capable of providing loving comfort to a wife about to be stoned to death. Yet, despite such an apparently cold and loveless marital relationship, Susanna continues to persist in her manifestation of a passive and submissive attitude becoming assertive enough to defend herself against accusations but rarely. Her submission, passivity, belief, piety and virtue is, of course, ultimately rewarded in that the child Daniel brings to light the truth concerning the accusations hurled against her.

If Susanna's reward is to be salvation and a safe restoration to her family then, clearly, Dina, Scortum and Meretrix, the antitheses of Susanna, and transgressors against all of the moral and religious codes of the time, justly deserve retribution and punishment. Such, however, does not transpire in all three cases because in the comedy Von einem Weibe Heinrich Julius portrays the clever and agile Meretrix calmly hoodwinking Thomas Mercator, her mentally and physically impaired husband. In demonstrating Meretrix' inner ambivalence regarding her relationship with her husband and with her lover, and in emphasizing the suspicions which she arouses in her husband, Heinrich Julius seems to be indicating that perhaps the outcome of Meretrix' adulterous behaviour might well be a 'tragic' end similar to that suffered by Dina and Scortum. As Meretrix' ultimate fate is not revealed in the play it must forever remain within the realm of speculation, although we are left in no doubt at all concerning Heinrich Julius' general view that adulterous behaviour merits drastic punishment.

It is worth noting that Heinrich Julius considers both Dina (Buler vnd Bulerin) and Scortum (Ehebrecherin) to be 'bö's' - a term which he assigns to all women who abuse the man in some manner. In Dina's case,

she is 'b00s' because she physically mistreats Ioseph, whereas Scortum is considered to be 'b00s' merely because Gallichoraea suspects her of committing adultery.

The marriages of all three adulterous wives are in any event nothing but a sham. Both Meretrix and Scortum use their husbands merely to provide themselves with their own material needs - Scortum even going so far as to use her husband's money to reward her lover. Since neither Mercator nor Gallichoraea are shown as abusing their wives, it is clear that Heinrich Julius intended to make it clear that the wives have little reason for cuckolding their husbands. In Dina and Ioseph's case, however, the author provides motivation for the conflict and for the dissolution of the marriage in portraying a May-December union which clearly constitutes a situation of some odium to both partners. Additionally, in Dina, Heinrich Julius portrays a wife as seen from the various perspectives of her servants, her husband and her lover.

If Dina manifests typically shrewishly aggressive behaviour towards her husband, even to the point of tearing out his beard, neither Meretrix nor Scortum overtly mistreat their husbands. Dina in addition shows a total disregard and contempt for gossip and is unconcerned about being seen with her lover, whereas both Meretrix and Scortum take considerable pains to hide their lovers. In the tragedies, Heinrich Julius condemns any display of 'leichtfertiges' behaviour by a woman and, as a penalty for such conduct both Dina and Scortum suffer drastic retribution; the one committing suicide, the other being hanged by the devil. In stark contrast to this, in the comedy, Meretrix, although equally as guilty as Dina and Scortum, is apparently permitted to remain unpunished.

Heinrich Julius shows some ambivalence in his perceptions of court ladies in the manner in which he presents them. A comparison of the roles of Eleonora (Vincentio Ladislao) and Patientia (Ungeratenen Sohn) immediately renders us aware of the fact that each consults with and discusses diverse matters with her husband. However, the substance of their consultations differs drastically, for while Seuerus discusses matters of state with Patientia and hopes that his son will continue the practice, Silvester's discussion with Eleonora involves nothing more weighty than his plans for the public embarrassment of one of his subjects. Patientia, as might be expected, is shown as being held in considerable regard by her people, presumably as a result of her fairness, while no such respect is indicated in the case of Eleonora who is portrayed as acceding all too easily to her husband's ignoble scheme. Heinrich Julius thus contrasts the high esteem in which Patientia is held by her family, state counsellors and her people, with his portrayal of Eleonora, in which he reveals that even high ranking women can stoop to levels as low as those of the coarsest of peasants in consenting to play an embarrassing and crude joke on another human being. Patientia is portrayed as a regal and mature matron; Eleonora merely appears silly and base.

In their use of coarse language, the peasant women (Von einem Wirthe), particularly Greth and Lena, share a common characteristic with Dina and Meretrix both of whom are in the habit of using language stronger than necessary at times when the impending arrival of their respective husbands threatens to disturb their dalliance. If the actual portrayal of the characters in the peasant scenes is as realistic as the critical literature suggests, then we must conclude that Heinrich Julius also

considered peasant women to be stupid and aggressive. The peasants, furthermore, are shown to assess a person partially upon the basis of appearance and partially upon the basis of language and in this they differ little from the folk of the court who consider Vincentius to be an eccentric fool. In addition, in failing to consider that their own dialect might contribute to a significant degree to the confusion which leads them, unsympathetically, to brand Iohan the servant as little more than a fool, the peasants share a trait characteristic of many other of the portrayals in the plays analysed: blindness to one's own faults with transfer of responsibility for the course which events take onto other, often innocent, shoulders.

It might be noted at this point that some remarkable correspondences exist between the apparent classification of women in Heinrich Julius' plays and that adopted by the British Army some three centuries later, for the British refer to Officers' 'ladies', Sergeants' 'wives', Private Soldiers' 'women' while Heinrich Julius characterizes Court 'ladies', 'Citizens' 'wives', and Peasant 'women'. To be sure we should not stretch this point too far, and indeed some women portrayed in the plays manage to transcend such artificial barriers, for can Eleonora be considered better than a peasant woman in her behaviour, or can Dina and Meretrix be considered better than peasant women in their indiscreet choice of language? Surely, too, Susanna displays all the grace and dignity of a court lady as she handles her travails.

Thus, interestingly, Heinrich Julius shows instances of women transgressing the boundaries of behaviour normally circumscribed by their social position, while at the same time implying specific ranges of virtues and attributes which are related to class and rank. He shows a

high minded court lady of unimpeachable conduct as well as a thoughtless one, and reveals that in court circles the ladies share some measure of equality in discussion with their husbands. At a lower level he portrays the generally submissive or aggressive wives of the merchant or burgher class, wives, moreover, who display a general propensity towards unseemly behaviour, although even in this group Susanna magnificently transcends the limits of the behavioural characteristics set out for her class. It is probably fair to say that the peasant women are portrayed the most poorly and in the most simplistic manner of all, being shown as being vulgar and lacking any level of expression other than suspicion.

In these portrayals we have perhaps a vital clue to the understanding of the factors underlying the basis for the structuring of the character roles in Heinrich Julius' plays. Two things need to be considered: Heinrich Julius' own range of personal experience, and the moral standards and outlook of Heinrich Julius' times.

Heinrich Julius must have been brought up in a fairly rarefied court atmosphere from which he would have been able to draw portraits, from direct experience, of the court ladies in his plays; Eleonora being the portrait of one such lady, an empty-headed wife of a court intriguer perhaps, Patientia being modelled upon one of his wives or perhaps even his own mother. As to the burghers' wives, Heinrich Julius was a noted debauchee in his time and, as some of his carousing must undoubtedly have been 'on the town', he himself doubtlessly performed on many an occasion 'in the flesh' as it were, as lover of a town lady or of the bored wife of a burgher. One is even tempted to speculate on how many times in his youth he might have fled in terror from discovery, or upon the number of occasions upon which he may have hidden in a chest

or cupboard.

Both court lady and townswoman are portrayed fairly well and with some insight in the plays, but what of the peasant women? It is perhaps not surprising, in view of his lofty position, that Heinrich Julius' portrayals reflect a view of the peasantry common among aristocrats and burgher writers such as Hans Sachs.

We have also to consider the issue of moral standards and social strictures as they apply to the ordinary 'real' woman as opposed to the ideal woman, experience versus theory, reality versus philosophy. The 'judgment', using that term in the broadest of senses, which is passed upon or implied with respect to many of the women in the plays is perhaps overemphasized and dramatized, and we have to exercise a little caution in avoiding too literal an interpretation of this dramatic genre. However, we also must recognize that Heinrich Julius was a man of his time, an autocratic ruler and a judge and must surely have reflected the prevailing views of his time both with respect to the various roles of women and to contemporary moral standards.

In these respects, then, we catch perhaps but a glimpse of German woman of the sixteenth century, a glimpse from the lofty and rarefied heights which, in relative terms, Heinrich Julius occupied, a glimpse which contains many distortions on the one hand because of the biases instilled in him by his social position, as well as many perceptive insights on the other which were based upon Heinrich Julius' own direct experience of life as a man, as a churchman, as an autocratic ruler and as a judge.

REFERENCES

A. Primary Literature

- Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig. Die Schauspiele des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig. Nach alten Drucken und Handschriften hrsg. von Wilhelm Ludwig Holland. Stuttgart, 1855. Reprint Amsterdam: Editions RODOPI, 1967.
- _____. Die Schauspiele des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig. Hrsg. von Julius Tittmann. Leipzig: 1880. (Deutsche Dichter des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, Bd. 14)
- _____. Von einem Weibe. Von Vincentio Ladislao: Komödien. Hrsg. Manfred Brauneck. Stuttgart: P. Reclam, 1967.

B. Secondary Literature

- Baesecke, Anna. Das Schauspiel der Englischen Komödianten in Deutschland: Seine dramatische Form und seine Entwicklung. Halle an der Saale, 1935. Reprint Wiesbaden: Martin Sändig, 1974. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, Hft. 87)
- Baumgartner, W. "Susanna: Die Geschichte einer Legende." Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 24 (1926), 259-280.
- Berent, Eberhard. "Frauenverehrung und Frauenverachtung in der Dichtung des frühen Barock." In: Studies in Germanic Languages and Literature. Ed. R. A. Fowkes and V. Sander. Reutlingen: Hutzler, 1967. 21-34.
- Brüggemann, Fritz. Versuch einer Zeitfolge der Dramen des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig aus den Jahren 1590 bis 1594. Aachen: Aachener Verlags- und Druckerei-Gesellschaft, 1926.
- Burger, Harald. "Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig: 'Vincentius Ladislaus'; Zu einer Kontroverse der Literaturkritik." Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch, N.F. 9 (1968), 65-82.
- Cardoza, Minna Ploug. The presentation of women in sixteenth-century Lutheran biblical drama. Diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1968.
- Casey, Paul F. The Susanna theme in German literature: Variations of the biblical drama. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1976. (Abhandlungen zur Kunst-, Musik- und Literaturwissenschaft, Bd. 214)

Cohn, Albert. "Englische Komödianten in Köln (1592-1656)." Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 21 (1886), 245-276.

_____. Shakespeare in Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: An account of English actors in Germany and the Netherlands and of the plays performed by them during the same period. London, 1865. Reprint Wiesbaden: M. Sändig, 1967.

Creizenach, W. Die Schauspiele der Englischen Komödianten. Berlin, 1888. Reprint Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967.

Emmrich, Christian. "Die Darstellung von Ehe und Ehebruch in den Dramen des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig (1564-1613)." Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller Universität Jena, 14 (1965), 663-676.

_____. Das dramatische Werk des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig. Habilitationsschrift, Jena, Februar 1963.

Flemming, Willi. "Die Auffassung des Menschen im 17. Jahrhundert." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 6 (1928), 404-446.

_____. "Der deutsche Barockmensch und sein Theater." Maske und Kothurn, 7 (1961), 197-208.

_____. Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter des Barocks. 2. neu bearb. Aufl. Konstanz: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1960. (Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte, 1. Abt.: Zeitalter deutscher Kultur)

_____. "Das Jahrhundert des Barock." Annalen der deutschen Literatur. Hrsg. von Heinz Otto Burger. 2. überarbeitete Aufl. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971. 339-404.

Freden, Gustaf. "'Those that play your clowns ...'." Moderna Språk, 58 (1964), 317-331.

Friedenthal, Richard. Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig als Dramatiker. I. Sein Leben mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines geistigen Werdeganges. Inaugural-Diss. München, 1922.

Gillet, Joseph E. "The German dramatist of the 16th century and his Bible." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 34 (1919), 465-493.

_____. "Über den Zweck des Dramas in Deutschland im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 32 (1917), N.S. 25, 430-467.

- Gillet, Myrtle Mann. "Woman in German literature before and after the Reformation." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 17 (1918), 346-375.
- Grimm, Herman Friedrich. "Das Theater des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig zu Wolfenbüttel." [Westermanns Monatshefte] 1856, 142-182.
- Holl, Karl. Geschichte des deutschen Lustspiels. Leipzig: J.J. Weber, 1923.
- Kawerau, Waldemar. Die Reformation und die Ehe. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Halle: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1892.
- Knight, A. H. J. Heinrich Julius Duke of Brunswick. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1948. (Modern language studies)
- _____. "The tragi-comedies of Duke Heinrich Julius of Brunswick." Modern Language Review, 41 (1946), 164-176.
- _____. "Zum Studium der Tragödien des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, 25 (1937), 100-119.
- Koebner, Richard. "Die Eheauffassung des ausgehenden deutschen Mittelalters." Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 9 (1911), 136-198; 279-318.
- Milde, Wolfgang. "The library at Wolfenbüttel, from 1550 to 1618." Modern Language Review, 66 (1971), 101-112.
- Müller, Günther. "Höfische Kultur." In: Deutsche Barockforschung: Dokumentation einer Epoche. Hrsg. von Richard Alewyn. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1965. 183-203.
- Newald, Richard. Die deutsche Literatur vom Späthumanismus zur Empfindsamkeit, 1570-1750. 3. verb. Aufl. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- _____. "Humanismus und Reformation." Annalen der deutschen Literatur. Hrsg. von Heinz Otto Burger. 2. Überarbeitete Aufl. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971. 287-338.
- Pilger, Robert. "Die Dramatisierungen der Susanna im 16. Jahrhundert. Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Dramas." Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie, 11 (1880), 129-217.
- Stammler, Wolfgang. Von der Mystik zum Barock 1400-1600. 2. durchgesehene u. erweiterte Aufl. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1950.

Steinhausen, Georg. Geschichte der deutschen Kultur. Leipzig:
Bibliographisches Institut, 1904.

Werner, Ingrid. Zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit: Heinrich Julius von
Braunschweig als Dramatiker der Übergangszeit. Frankfurt/M:
P. Lang, 1976.

B30204